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THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Mr Kell.

MR KELL: Good morning, Commissioner. I call Detective Chief Inspector David Anthony Waddell.
<DAVID ANTHONY WADDELL, sworn:
[9.47am]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:

MR KELL: Q. Could please state your full name?
A. It's David Anthony Wadde11.
Q. You're a detective inspector of the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes, that's correct.

MR SAIDI: Could it be noted that witness also relies on the privilege of section 123 of Special Commissions of Inquiry Act.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi, that is understood.

MR KELL: Q. You are currently attached to the Tuggerah Lakes Local Area Command?
A. Yes.
Q. You have provided a signed statement to the Commission dated 18 March 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a copy of your statement handy?
A. I do.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, they are.

MR KELL: I tender that statement.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Is there a copy that I may have, please.

MR KELL: Certain1y.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. The statement of Detective Inspector David Anthony Waddell will be admitted and marked exhibit 6.

## EXHIBIT \#6 STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE INSPECTOR DAVID ANTHONY WADDELL

MR KELL: Q. If you put the statement to one side, I will come back and ask you some questions about it. By way of background, you have been a police officer since 1990?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've been involved in criminal investigations since 1996?
A. Yes .
Q. You were promoted to the rank of detective sergeant in 2000?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You've held the rank of detective inspector since 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. From 2008 to 2011 you were based at the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. At that time you held the position of crime manager?
A. Yes.
Q. And you currently hold the position of crime manager at Tuggerah Lakes Local Area Command?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. In your statement at paragraph 6, you refer to the position of crime manager at Lake Macquarie Local Area Command?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder if you could assist the Commissioner by detailing in brief fashion the principle duties and responsibilities of a crime manager?
A. My principal duties were managing all the major investigations within the command, which included sexual assault investigations, homicide investigations, as well as having overall responsibility for all investigations, case management within the command. In most times, we were getting within the vicinity of 500 cases within the
command.
Q. Just pausing there, when you refer to "the command", you're referring to your time at the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command?
A. The Lake Macquarie Local Area Command as well as being responsible for the units directly under myself, which included the detectives and the proactive teams and the intel areas, their management, performance and welfare.
Q. Pausing there, you referred to the number of investigations at any given point in time. What's the approximate number which you would have?
A. There would be about 500 cases on average within the command at any one time, all types of matters obviously. Specifically there would be in the vicinity of 80 to 100 cases in the detectives office of a more serious nature and then some obviously major strike forces that would be running.
Q. In 2010 when you were at Lake Macquarie, how many detectives did you have management responsibility for?
A. In the vicinity of 20 detectives, but probably 50 staff all up.
Q. And by "50 staff", you mean 50 police officers?
A. Yes.
Q. So detectives and --
A. Intelligence units, crime management units and proactive teams.
Q. What steps did you take to keep abreast of particular investigations that you had overall management?
A. The main step would be through briefings with the staff and particularly the detective sergeants.
Q. Was that done on a regular basis?
A. Pretty much daily.
Q. Of the total number of investigations, was there a particular briefing done daily for all of them or just on a weekly basis?
A. It would depend on what were the major focuses at the current time.
Q. As crime manager, what was the particular reporting
structure? To whom did you report at Lake Macquarie?
A. To the commander.
Q. And at that time in 2010, who was that?
A. September it was Superintendent Rae.
Q. Did junior officers, junior detectives report direct to you?
A. No, they reported to the detective sergeants, but I would often have conversations or briefings from individual detectives.
Q. How many detective sergeants did you have at Lake Macquarie?
A. There was one - sorry, there were two detective sergeants and one senior sergeant.
Q. Who were they?
A. The investigations manager was Chad Gillies and the detective sergeants were - well, they actually changed. Kristi Faber was there for the duration, and I had Bill G1enn for a period of time and then he was replaced by Grant Erickson.
Q. I think you indicated that as crime manager, you had an overall management responsibility for investigations at Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also as crime manager have an involvement in active investigation?
A. No, not actively. I supervised and managed and led the investigations, but I didn't actively investigate other than critical incidents.
Q. What are critical incidents?
A. Critical incidents was when there was a death or serious injury as a result of a police operation.
Q. So putting to one side critical incidents, during your time at Lake Macquarie, were you involved in any active investigation as a crime manager?
A. I was involved in managing them, leading them and giving directions, providing resources, and managing the performance and welfare associated with staff in those investigations. I didn't take an active part insofar as taking statements or anything of witnesses.
Q. In your experience, is that common for a crime manager not to take an active role in investigations other than at the management level?
A. Yes, that's normally the case.
Q. In your experience, what is the reason for that, or reasons?
A. Because that is not the role. Essentially, as I said, there are number of ongoing major investigations within the command as well as the volume crime issues to manage as well as the crime issues. You don't have the time or capability to be conducting investigations other than the occasional complaint or critical incident.
Q. So there are practical considerations to which you refer, are there, that would impact on the ability of a crime manager to be involved in in an investigation?
A. Definitely.
Q. And one you referred to is time?
A. Yes.
Q. There are just significant time limitations, are there?
A. Time limitations, definitely. It is very important to mange your time. But also it wasn't my role to be actively involved in the investigations; I was responsible for the management and leading of those investigations.
Q. And that's a structural limitation, as it were?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there any other practical considerations, other than time, that would limit the involvement of you as a crime manager in an active investigation, other than at the management level?
A. Yes, there is. I think you need to maintain some sort of oversight and a helicopter-type view of things. If you get bogged down in an investigation, you're not able to manage the other issues that are arising.
Q. Let me just ask you about a related topic. Have you encountered the circumstance of a crime manager from another local area command coming across to a local area command that was conducting an investigation and taking an investigative role in that investigation?
A. No, I have not.
Q. When I ask that question, I'm asking you to put to one side the critical incidents exception, if you like.
A. Yes.
Q. So the situation that I have just posited, you have not encountered that?
A. No, no.
Q. I take it that's in all the time that you have been a police officer since 1990?
A. Yes, I have never encountered that situation.
Q. In addition to the practical limitations to which you referred that would impact on you as a crime manager being involved in an investigation in your local area command, in that situation that I posited, are there other additional limitations that would make it impractical or difficult in any way - and if there are, tell us what they are - in such a person having involvement?
A. I think the main issues would be resourcing.

Obviously that position would need to be backfilled.
Q. Just pausing there, when you say "that position would need to be backfilled", what do you mean?
A. The position from the command that's been left, and there's a cost implication.
Q. And what is that?
A. Again, that is that the position that has been left would have to be backfilled and someone would have to relieve in that position. So it was really about costing and resourcing and apart from the fact that you really want the right level of experience and expertise in the investigation.
Q. In your statement at paragraph 6, you provided the Commission with some information relating to Strike Force Georgiana?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was a strike force - tell me if this is correct - that was looking into allegations of child sexual abuse by certain persons formerly associated with the Maitland-Newcastle diocese?
A. Yes. In the main, I should say, in the main.
Q. That was a strike force, was it, that was being conducted out of Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. I don't want you to name any particular persons of interest or witnesses, but I just wonder if you could give some general description of the ambit and the subject of Strike Force Georgiana?
A. Strike Force Georgiana commenced prior to me being in Lake Macquarie. It was already running. Specifically, it was looking at five persons of interest. It was being led by Detective Sergeant Faber and had a number of staff from Lake Macquarie and also from Newcastle at that stage, I believe.
Q. Just pausing there, when you refer to staff from Newcastle, were they junior detective staff or more senior? A. Two detective senior constables and that staff changed during my time there.
Q. Did Georgiana expand or contract in any way during the time that you were at Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes, it changed a number of times with staffing and with the specific targets or persons of interests that it was looking at.
Q. Just to be clear, McAlinden or Fletcher, who are named in this Commission's terms of reference, were never the subject of inquiry by Georgiana?
A. No, they were not.
Q. That's because they pre-dated the establishment of Georgiana effectively - the offences they committed as perpetrators?
A. Yes, I don't know if that was the main reason, but they were not specifically being looked at. There was five persons of interest at the time that I was managing the investigation and they were not the focus of the investigation.
Q. In 2010, to what extent was Georgiana making demands on the investigative resources that you had overall management for in Lake Macquarie?
A. At that stage with Georgiana, the main person of interest had predominantly already been charged. There was one further charge in, I think it was, April 2010.

Detective Sergeant Faber was still, I suppose, oversighting the investigation but was working full-time on a murder investigation at the time. So we had scaled back Georgiana at that point in time in 2010.
Q. Did it subsequently expand when you were there?
A. Not while I was there, no. There was some ongoing investigation, but it didn't expand to a full-blown investigation while $I$ was there as a strike force.
Q. In your statement, you also refer to a Strike Force Lozano. Again was that a Strike Force being conducted from Lake Macquarie at the time that you were there?
A. Yes, I initiated Strike Force Lozano.
Q. Again I'm not inviting you to name any particular persons of interest or witnesses, but if you could indicate the subject matter of the strike force that you initiated? A. Yes, Strike Force Lozano was a major sexual assault investigation looking at initially four persons of interest and approximately 20 victims. There are a lot more persons of interest now. It's still an ongoing investigation and there are numerous victims, in excess of 50, and again, it's sexual assaults by the clergy.
Q. In mid-2010, to what extent was Strike Force Lozano making demands on the investigative resources that you were managing?
A. We had at least two to three detectives on the investigation at that point in time as well as analysts and other investigators helping on an interim sort of basis, so the staffing for that investigation changed again as a group. Essentially, initially there were two to three detectives working on it.
Q. In your statement, you indicate that in about April 2010, the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command received certain documents from Joanne McCarthy, who is a senior journalist at the Newcastle Herald?
A. Yes.
Q. We will come back to the details of all of that and you subsequently forwarded the documents on to the Newcastle Local Area Command?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder if you could reach for volume 1 of what is
the three-volume tender bundle next to you. You'11 see there are numbers tabbed on the right-hand side?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you to go to tab 27. You will see there is a receipt of documents of 23 April 2010 from Shaun McLeod to Joanne McCarthy?
A. Yes.
Q. Then following that, there are some 16 pages of documents?
A. Yes.
Q. In your statement you indicate that the documents you received in April or May 2010 you attached to a report of 3 May 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder, doing the best you can, whether you're able to indicate whether these are the documents that you attached to your report that you saw?
A. I don't recall them, but I believe they would be the documents, yes.
Q. When you say you believe they would be --
A. Because they were the documents that Shaun McLeod, Detective Shaun McLeod, has given a receipt to Joanne McCarthy for on 23 April and they were the documents that you were referred to in my report on 3 May.
Q. In terms of the quantity of documents that you attached to your report of 3 May, does the quantity effectively --
A. Yes, I believe so, yes.
Q. That's about the size?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of the nature of the documents, do you have any recollection as to whether they were documents of this type, this character?
A. Yes, I believe so. I believe that would be them, but I do not recall the actual documents. I remember - I recall the content or the subject matter, but not the actual documents as such.
Q. Put that to one side for the moment, please. What
were the circumstances in which you received the documents, and I think you indicated you received them from Shaun McLeod?
A. Look, I don't recall actually receiving the documents, but they did definitely come from Shaun McLeod and he received them from Joanne McCarthy. I don't recall whether he handed them to me personally or whether they were left in the tray or whether they were handed to me by possibly Detective Sergeant Faber, but I know they came into my possession and I know that I reviewed them and, as a result of that, I completed a document on 3 May, which I then forwarded to the Newcastle Local Area Command. I'm also aware that I had conversations with a number of persons in relation to the documents.
Q. I'11 come back to that in a minute. Do you recall approximately when you received the documents, how -A. I know that the article that was written in the paper, which relates to these documents, in the Newcastle Herald, was 28 April. The documents are dated 23 April. That's when Shaun took them into his possession. So it was sometime between 23 and 28 Apri1.
Q. You made reference to an article in the Newcastle Herald of 28 April?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for identification purposes, could you jump to tab 28 of that folder. You'll see there is page numbering at the bottom centre of those pages?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to page 104(a)?
A. No, it only goes to 104 --
Q. Perhaps if you go past the next tab. Does that have it?
A. Yes, 104(a).
Q. Is that the article to which you referred in evidence?
A. Again, I don't recall the actual article, but that's dated 28 April, so that would be it.
Q. You'11 see on the second page there's a reference to yourself about halfway down:

Lake Macquarie Police Detective Inspector

Dave Waddell said police were reviewing the Herald's documents ...
A. Yes.
Q. That gives you some indication, does it, that you had received those documents by that day?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: I'11 just hand up some diary entries which have been provided this morning. I'11 hand up a copy for the Commissioner.
Q. Firstly, can you identify these documents?
A. Yes, they are entries from my diary in 2010.
Q. And that's your handwriting?
A. Yes.
Q. When were each of the entries made?
A. During that - on that day.
Q. As events happened?
A. Yes, essentially, they are things that I recall whether I had conversations or talking to people.
Q. Again, if you go to the third page, which is a diary entry of 28 April, you'11 see there's an entry that starts, "Review material"?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that on to the transcript, please?
A. Yes:

Review material relating to Catholic Church
cover up Newcastle Herald involving
Father Denis McAlinden and Bishops Leo
Clarke, Michael Malone and Philip Wilson.
Q. That is the same day as the newspaper article that you've taken us to?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that indicate, as it seems to, that you were reviewing material at that time?
A. Yes, that's the first note I've got of actually receiving or reviewing that material.
Q. The next entry on that page, I wonder if you could read that on to the transcript?
A. It is in relation to talking to Joanne McCarthy, in relation to the Herald article and follow-up and I've got "police investigation" --
Q. Perhaps if you just read from where it says "Joanne McCarthy"?
A. Yes:

Joanne McCarthy re Herald article and
follow-up - Police investigating.
Assessment to be made - offences and evidence - decision as to who will investigate.
Q. And what does that entry indicate?
A. Essentially that I had a conversation with Joanne McCarthy --
Q. Can you tell us whether that was a telephone conversation?
A. It would have been a telephone conversation, yes.
Q. And what have you told her?
A. Essentially that in relation to the police investigation, that $I$ had to make an assessment of the available evidence and the relevant offences and then make a decision as to who would investigate that matter.
Q. Do you recall whether she had phoned you or you had phoned her?
A. No, I don't, I'm sorry.
Q. I wonder if you could go to the next page, which is 29 April 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. There's an entry at the top there. I wonder if you could read that onto the record?
A. Yes :

Kirsti Faber re media interest - McAlinden
sex offences and cover-up by the Catholic
Church - review.
Q. What does that diary entry indicate?
A. Essentially I was going to get Kirsti Faber to review the material.
Q. So that was a statement of a plan that you had at that time?
A. Look, I believe I would have had conversations with Kristi about that. I don't know that I ever got her to review the material - she may or may not have because she was working on a homicide investigation at the time. I know I conducted a review, as I said, of the material and then forwarded it on to Newcastle.
Q. In the middle of that page, there's an entry that starts with the words, "Paul Jacob"?
A. Yes.
Q. Can just read that entry?
A. Yes. Paul Jacob was a detective inspector from the

Sex Crimes Squad and I had rung him -- -
Q. Pausing there, could you read that entry?
A. Yes:

Paul Jacob Sex Crime re McAlinden/Wilson, back tomorrow.

It says "back tmoz", but back tomorrow.
Q. That's just a shorthand for "back tomorrow"?
A. Yes, I've obviously rung him and he wasn't available and he would be back not office tomorrow.
Q. Then the next line, if you could read that?
A. It says:

Tim Seymour re McAlinden/Wilson.
Q. Who was Tim Seymour?
A. Tim was the crime manager at Hunter Valley where the original McAlinden offences occurred. I believe I've attempted to contact him to speak to him about that matter and also a homicide investigation we were conducting and I don't recall whether I actually spoke to him or not.
Q. So it's a note here sort of either a contact or an attempted contact?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can't tell from that which one it is?
A. No.
Q. When you referred to the Hunter Valley being the scene of an original - sorry, what did you indicate?
A. I believe that's where the original McAlinden offences were.
Q. Is the Hunter Valley location within the Newcastle City Local Area Command or that's a different command?
A. That's a different command.
Q. Then there's a further entry that starts, "Craig Rae"?
A. Yes:

Craig Rae update re Herald coverage Catholic Church cover-up and priests complaint received.

And then it goes on to talk about another issue.
Q. So with that entry, we can take it that the relevant entry ends with the word "received"?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I might indicate that the words after "received" will be redacted from the final version of this exhibit because it doesn't relate to the matters of interest.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: Q. Craig Rae was your superintendent at the time?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. What does that entry indicate?
A. Just that I told him that we received the complaint and that $I$ was going to review it.
Q. If you go to the next page, which is the next day, Friday, 30 April?
A. Yes.
Q. Again we are in the period before you've written your
report of 3 May that we will come to?
A. Yes.
Q. Then, on that page, I think there are two entries. In the middle there's a reference to Peter Gogarty?
A. Yes .
Q. And there's a phone number which I won't ask you to read out.

Commissioner that will be redacted from the final version of this document.

After the phone number, it says "Peter Gogarty re"; could you continue reading that?
A. It says.
... re material supp1ied by Joanne McCarthy in relation to McAlinden and Wilson
Q. What does that entry indicate?
A. Well, it indicates that I was going to call him or he had called me in relation to that matter.
Q. I think in your statement you attach as annexure B a letter sent by Peter Gogarty?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Also a letter dated 3 May 2010?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Firstly, do you recall when you phoned Peter Gogarty or he phoned you?
A. No, no, I don't - I don't recall speaking to him. I know I received a document from him, though, and --
Q. Does this diary entry indicate to you that you did speak to him or that --
A. It indicates, yes, that I was going to speak to him or that I did speak to him. I don't recall actually speaking to him.
Q. On that day?
A. No, I don't recall speaking to him, but I know - I believe I spoke to Peter Gogarty and I received a document from him which was part of the documents I forwarded to Newcastle, but I don't recall the conversation.
Q. So do you recall a conversation with Peter Gogarty around about this time?
A. I believe I spoke to him, but I don't recall speaking to him. But I have a note there at least I was going to speak to him.
Q. What is that makes you believe you spoke to him?
A. I just recollect receiving the document from him and I do believe I had a phone call from him or I to him.
Q. Attachment $B$ to your statement is a letter dated 3 May 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Which was obviously after this. Are you able to help us any further as to what it was that caused you to attempt to speak with Peter Gogarty on 30 April?
A. It would have only been in relation to the information that had been provided as part of the complaint.
Q. At the bottom of that page there's an entry that commences with the word "Paul Jacob"?
A. Yes.
Q. I think that entry ends at the word "Newcastle"?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that entry from Paul Jacob through to "Newcastle?
A. It says:

Paul Jacob re McAlinden/Wilson matter -not a matter Sex Crimes will look at. Can provide consultancy. McAlinden and Clarke - deceased. Hunter Valley - no. Wilson and Malone - reasonable excuse - re report up the line of command and since reported to police.

And then:
Conceal - refer to Newcastle.
Q. Pausing there, does that diary entry indicate a
telephone communication with --
A. Yes, a telephone conversation with Paul Jacob, who was
a detective inspector at Sex Crimes. I had rung him to ask him whether it was a matter that Sex Crimes would investigate.
Q. By Sex Crimes, you're referring to the Sex Crimes unit at the State Crime Command?
A. Yes.
Q. And I spoke to him in relation to a number of matters related to my time at Lake Macquarie including Lozano and Georgiana. My recollection was it was something that they were not in a position to assist with the investigation at that time, but he said, "We can provide consultancy." Then we had some general discussion about the investigation and some issues or impediments to the investigation and how we might go about it. At the end of that conversation, I believe that the decision that I made was that $I$ was going to look at the conceal offences and refer them on to Newcastle Local Area Command.
Q. Where it says in the entry at the end "refer to Newcastle", is that a statement made by Detective Jacob to you or that's a notation?
A. No, that's a note I've made in relation to my thoughts on the matter, that the conceal offences needed to be investigated and they needed to be investigated, I believed, by the Newcastle command.
Q. So that's a record of your intention at that time of 30 April?
A. Yes.
Q. The reference to, "Hunter Valley - no" can you indicate what that refers to?
A. It's in relation to whether there needed to be any further investigation regarding the initial sexual assault matters and obviously the fact that the person is deceased, there was no further investigation in relation to those matters required.
Q. Going through that note, you start at the beginning or near the beginning, "not a matter Sex Crimes will look at; can provide a consultancy." Do we take it that is really information being relayed to you by Detective Jacob? A. Yes, they were not in a position to look at that at that point in time. That may have been because of staffing resources or other investigations they had going or it may
be a matter that they didn't think they necessarily needed to investigate. I don't know the exact reasons.
Q. But you don't recall now if any reasons were given to you at the time?
A. No, I spoke to Paul on a number of times about different investigations.
Q. Then it says:

McAlinden and Clarke - deceased, Hunter Valley - no.
A. Yes.
Q. Who made those statements? Was that --
A. No, that's just a note I made while I'm talking Essentially, the "Hunter Valley - no" was that there was no further requirement to investigate the sexual assault matters because obviously the person was deceased, so it was more about investigating the conceal.
Q. So the "Hunter Valley - no" is a reference to McAlinden as a perpetrator?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall whether that's a statement that you made or a statement that Detective Jacob made and you recorded here?
A. No. It's just notes that were made during the conversation.
Q. So they are not necessarily reflecting part of the natural conversation - the terms of the conversation?
A. No, no.
Q. Then it says:

Wilson and Malone - reasonable excuse.
A. Yes, we were discussing the investigation.
Q. Then it says, "ie, report up line of command"?
A. Yes, we were discussing the investigations and impediments, I suppose, or constraints that would have to be covered within the investigation.
Q. So these are sort of early musings about that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember whether they were musings that you made or Detective Jacob made?
A. No, I don't. They were just discussions that we had in relation to the investigation and potential issues.
Q. Was that an opinion that you had formed at that time and held or --
A. That was a consideration, yes.
Q. If I could ask you to turn to Monday, 3 May, which is the next diary entry.
A. Yes.
Q. I think there are two entries about hal fway down the page.
A. Yes.
Q. The first one begins, "Shaun McLeod?
A. Yes, it says:

Shaun McLeod re welfare issues and
McAlinden/Wilson complaint advised to be referred to Newcastle, further investigations.
Q. Then I think there's a name there or --
A. There was a name there, yes.
Q. There was a name there that has been removed?
A. Yes.
Q. So "investigations", and then there is a reference to a particular --
A. Person of interest.
Q. Yes.
A. And then it says, "Refer to detective sergeants."
Q. What rank did Detective McLeod hold at Lake Macquarie?
A. He was a detective senior constable.
Q. Had he been attached to any of the strike forces?
A. Yes, he had been attached to Strike Force Georgiana.
Q. In that entry you refer to welfare issues?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, perhaps at a more general level what does the diary entry indicate?
A. I spoke to Shaun McLeod about some welfare issues that had been raised with me and also about the McAlinden/Wilson complaint and I had advised him that I would be referring that matter to Newcastle for further investigation.
Q. That was a meeting that you had that day with Detective McLeod?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Where did you hold that meeting?
A. It would have been my office.
Q. The reference to "welfare issues", whose welfare are you referring to?
A. To Shaun McLeod's welfare.
Q. What welfare issues did you have in mind when you were making that notation in your diary?
A. Look, there was a number of issues. On 9 April Shaun McLeod charged a person of interest in relation to Strike Force Georgiana. The week after that, around 15 April, I was talking to a Detective Sergeant Chad Gillies and Kirsti Faber about a number of investigative issues, not just Georgiana a number of issues, other strike forces and investigations. During that they raised concerns in relation to Shaun McLeod's behaviour that had been exhibited at the time of the arrest of the person of interest on the night.
Q. So that's a report to you by your detective sergeants?
A. Yes. And also concerns in relation to some of the ongoing dialogue he had been having with Joanne McCarthy from the Newcastle Herald in relation to the McAlinden matter that they had been made aware of. I had previously spoken to Shaun at the time of that arrest in relation to an authorised media release that he had made without speaking to me about it. So there was a number of concerns where he had exhibited stress and anxiety in relation to some of these matters.
Q. Just pausing there, by 3 May of 2010, having regard to your note of welfare issues, what were some of those signs
of stress and distress that you noted?
A. There had been some specific issues raised in relation to the arrest and charge of the person of interest on the 9 th where he didn't cope very well with the whole scenario which was a fairly basic investigative step.
Q. What were the particular instances that occurred? A. Oh, simple things, simple things in relation to the charging process, organising the car to go and complete the charge. There was a range of issues and observations made by the detectives that were working with him and others in the office and the detective sergeants.
Q. You referred to a difficulty with a car; what was that?
A. Just organising a car to go up and complete the interview and the charge.
Q. What was the particular stress or distress that was representing to you?
A. He was having trouble with organising himself to get that job done, and that was raised. The other issues related to him not being able to focus on the task or the investigation at hand and looking at other matters and going off on tangents. He had already expressed an interest in going --
Q. When you say "going off on tangents", that is?
A. Looking at other investigations, not reporting up to detective sergeants and myself matters that had been reported to him.
Q. Is this in the context of the investigation of sexual assault, child sexual assault?
A. Yes, and to some extent the McAlinden matter, and he had already expressed interest in going straight from this investigation onto the subsequent one that I had initiated being Strike Force Lazano. So I had actually spoken to Shaun McLeod and to a couple of other detectives about the fact that I didn't want them to continue on to any further protracted sexual assault matters. I wanted them to do some other different types of investigations for their own welfare and their own health.
Q. Just explain that process. How would that work? So you would take a particular officer off --
A. Not off the investigation, but when that Strike Force
finished, I didn't want them to become tied up with another protracted sexual assault-type investigation on a strike force basis.
Q. What's the reason for that?
A. For their welfare and particularly with Shaun in relation to his welfare and some of the signs that he was exhibiting.
Q. Tell me if this is not correct, but is the need to be alive to welfare issues a matter that particularly resonates in sexual assault investigations?
A. Yes, I believe so. I believe it's something in my role as a crime manager to look out for with all our staff. The detective sergeants had raised the issue with me. I know they had spoken to Shaun McLeod prior to me speaking to him. So those concerns had been raised by myself on 3 May, and they had been raised previously with him by the detective sergeants as well.
Q. I think you referred to 15 April?
A. That was when the issues were raised with me by the detective sergeants.
Q. I think you've provided to the Commission diary entries for 9 and 15 April. Could you go back to the first page, which is 9 April?
A. Yes.
Q. Perhaps you could just read that?
A. Yes:

## Shaun McLeod re media release and

 authorisation.Faber is next to it. And then the note below is:
Bishop Malone re charging of ...
And then that has been replaced with "NP and assistant spoken to" --
Q. What does that entry indicate?
A. The first one is I spoke to Shaun McLeod about his media release that he made in relation to that arrest, which he hadn't sought any authorisation to give out to the media at that stage, and normally that should come from me
first and then oftentimes $I$ would do that myself.
Q. Why was that a matter of particular concern to note in the diary entry?
A. Because I had spoken to him about it, about the fact that he had made that media release without any authorisation may or may not have been appropriate. At the very least I would like to vet it first. The next one is:

Bishop Malone re charging of NP
[and] assistant spoken to.
Sorry, the one above has Faber has next to it, so I would have made Detective Sergeant Faber aware of that issue, or she may have made me aware of it.
Q. For relevance purposes, the entry relating to Shaun ends at "authorisation"?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a distinct --
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to 15 April, I think you have an entry about hal fway down the page?
A. Yes. There was an entry above that where myself and the detective sergeants were talking about a variety of investigative issues but during that conversation they have raised concerns in relation to Shaun McLeod.
Q. Who are the detective sergeants?
A. Detective senior Sergeant Chad Gillies and Detective Sergeant Kristi Faber.
Q. Could you please read that entry on to the record?
A. Yes:

Concerns voiced re Shaun McLeod - welfare
exhibited behaviour last Friday. Arrest
and charge of NP. Recent contact in
relationship with Joanne McCarthy re
alleged criminal complaint against Bishop
Philip Wilson and requests to assist
with ...
Q. Just pausing there, for a moment. Yes?
A. And assist to request with another sexual assault investigation, which was Strike Force Lozano. Then I've got:

Chad and Kristi to speak to next week and offer EAP.

Which is the employee assistance programme.
Q. What is that programme?
A. It's a welfare programme that's available to staff when they are suffering from welfare issues or psych issues, mental health issues.
Q. What was your recommendation?
A. Just support and making him aware those support services were available if he needed them.
Q. By "him", you are referring to Detective McLeod?
A. Detective McLeod, yes.
Q. The first sentence, "Concerns voiced re Shaun McLeod welfare exhibited behaviour last Friday", that is an entry that corresponds with the evidence that you've been giving to the Commissioner?
A. Yes, that's correct. Basically that entry says that concerns were voiced in relation to his welfare and they were due to his behaviour that he exhibited on a prior arrest and, also, his relationship with Joanne McCarthy re the alleged criminal complaint against Bishop Wilson which had come to the attention of the detective sergeants but hadn't been reported to us prior to that.
Q. What was the particular concern relating to that aspect?
A. Just the fact that he was receiving complaints and making inquiries in relation to a matter and it hadn't been reported or reported up.
Q. Reported up to?
A. To the detective sergeants. Generally speaking if a crime is reported, there should be some sort of a record made by way of a COPS event or otherwise. That's verified by a supervisor and then we determine what sort of investigation is going to be attributed to that complaint.
Q. Do you recal1, as at that time 15 April 2010, what the
nature of the concern was in the sense of how long -A. No.
Q. -- it was perceived that Detective McLeod had been looking at --
A. No, that's the first I had heard of it. It wasn't until much later that I actually received the complaint not much later but a week or so.
Q. Your recommendation was that Chad and Kristi speak next week and offer --
A. Speak to him about some of these issues, offer support, and make him aware of the support services that were available.
Q. Do you recall whether the support services were made available, whether that was brought to your attention? A. They are available. It's up to them to make contact.
Q. Do you recall receiving any report from your detective sergeants about support services and what had been said that following week - what had been said in any meetings by Detective Chad and Detective Kristi in the meeting the following week, as you proposed, with Detective McLeod? A. I know they met with him and I know support services were offered and likewise they were when I spoke to him on 3 May. I don't recall specifically but I think he may have already been seeking some sort of assistance already.
Q. Pausing there, Detective McLeod subsequently went off work?
A. Yes, in June or July of that year I believe.
Q. On medical grounds?
A. Yes.
Q. After he went off work, your recollection is
about June or July?
A. Yes, roughly. It wasn't long afterwards.
Q. Did he return at any time?
A. No, not that I recall. No.
Q. Is it the position that he subsequently has been medically discharged from the force?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. If you could go back to your entry of 3 May 2010, you indicated there:

Shaun McLeod re welfare issues and
McAlinden/Wilson complaint advised to be referred to Newcastle.
A. Yes. I've got:

Review McAlinden/Wilson matter Complete --
Q. Just on the entry above that, which is the meeting with Detective McLeod --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you advise him that the matter was to be referred to Newcastle?
A. Yes, I told him on that day:

Advised to be referred to Newcastle.
Q. Did you have any discussions with Detective McLeod about his involvement in clerical abuse matters?
A. I did have conversations with him about that matter about those issues. I don't recall it was on that date, but I definitely had conversations with Shaun that I didn't want him to be involved with any other protracted investigations of that nature for the welfare issues.
Q. That was on or about that day, was it - if not this day, around that time in early May?
A. Over probably the months prior and after, yes, I definitely had conversations with him about that.
Q. I think you indicated to the Commissioner that you had said to him that you didn't want him involved in any protracted sexual assault investigations.
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. What did you say to Detective McLeod as best you can recall?
A. I can't recall the exact nature of the conversation, but essentially it was that, due to the issues I've already spoken about and the behaviours displayed and the fact that we had these concerns, I didn't want him undertaking any further protracted investigations - and it wasn't just

Shaun that I discussed those issues with; I discussed them with other people as well.
Q. You said to him, in effect, that you didn't want him to be involved in any further --
A. Of a protracted nature. That was to protect his welfare. Obviously, in a busy detectives' office, they were still going to get involved in sexual assault investigations, but I didn't want him to get tied down with an extensive protracted-type investigation.
Q. As a statement from a senior officer to a detective senior constable, was it your intention in making that statement to him that you did not want him involved in any protracted investigations of that type, that your intention was that you were giving him an instruction about that matter rather than, for example, just some general guidance about the subject matter?
A. I believe I would have delivered it more as guidance; but, by the same token, I would have meant that I wasn't going to have him involved in another protracted investigation.
Q. May we take it that as the crime manager with overall responsibility for investigations that you were in a position to ensure - whether it be a guidance or an instruction - that your view about the matter prevailed? A. Most of the time, yes.
Q. In providing that guidance or instruction, did you have particularly in mind the welfare issues that you've referred to in this diary entry?
A. That's exactly what - that was the issue, yes, the on1y issue.
Q. When you had that discussion with Detective McLeod, what was his response when you told him that you didn't want him involved in any protracted investigations of a sexual assault nature?
A. I don't believe he was happy with it. I think he was accepting of it, or at least he said that he accepted it, but he had already expressed an interest in going on to the next strike force that we had initiated, Strike Force Lozano, when he completed the Georgiana investigation; so obviously he seemed very intent on pursuing those types of investigations and, look, down the track --
Q. Pausing there, he expressed his unhappiness to you in that conversation?
A. I don't recall his exact reaction, but I knew that he wasn't happy with the decision.
Q. But you maintained the decision in the face of that unhappiness from him?
A. Yeah. Look, there's no saying he couldn't go back and do those investigations down the track, but $I$ thought it was important for his health and longevity to try and get him to undertake other types of investigations.
Q. Other than this diary entry, which is 3 May, do you recall whether you made a written record of that instruction or guidance that you gave to Detective McLeod? A. I don't believe so. There would have been a document in relation to Shaun McLeod in medical notes or welfare-style documents, but not in relation to directions. It wasn't a direction as such; it was a discussion I had with him
Q. I think you indicated that you had discussions of a similar nature with other officers?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I won't ask you to name those officers, but was that around about the same time?
A. Yes.
Q. How many officers?
A. Probably at least two.
Q. Are they still serving officers?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. On 3 May 2010, you prepared a report, which is
annexure C to your statement
A. Yes, I did.
Q. The diary entry which I think you still have open on 3 May --
A. Yes.
Q. -- after the reference to refer to "detective
sergeants", there is one commencing "Review McAlinden/Wilson matter.
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that sentence on to the record?
A. Yes:

Review McAlinden/Wilson matter. Compile
[sic] corro...
Q. "Compile" or "complete"?
A. Sorry:

Complete corro and forward to Brad Tayler through Craig Rae.
Q. Is the reference there to "corro" a reference to your report of 3 May 2010, which is annexure C?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. That confirms, does it, that the report was prepared on that day and forwarded on that day?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for clarity, the report itself has two dates you'11 see on the front cover page there is a date of 3 May 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to the end of the report after your signature, there is a date of 19 April 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it that we ignore 19 April essentially and go to the correct date being on the front page?
A. Yes, 3 May was the date it was done. It's the date in the diary. The 19th, it must be from another report that I've copied to the macro.
Q. Prior to this report being prepared, what, if any, investigations had been carried out by Lake Macquarie Local Area Command in respect of what might be referred to as the Joanne McCarthy documents, the matters raised?
A. None that I was aware of an investigation.
Q. That reflects the time period in which you had those documents?
A. Yes.
Q. And the steps that you were taking to make a decision
as to who was investigating?
A. Yes.
Q. In the report of 3 May, you indicate in the third paragraph down that you have attached to that report copies of the documents received from Joanne McCarthy?
A. Yes.
Q. And they are forwarded with your report, are they, to - first on the chain of command on the second page your superintendent?
A. That's correct.
Q. With the intention that they be forwarded to Newcastle City Local Area Command.
A. Yes.
Q. What reason or reasons that you had in mind for forwarding the matter to Newcastle?
A. The complaint related to matters of concealing serious offence by the Maitland-Newcastle diocese of the Catholic Church.
Q. Those were the allegations that needed to be looked at?
A. Yes, and that fell within the Newcastle City Local Area Command.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because that's where it was based. That's where the diocese head offices were.
Q. That's a jurisdictional sort of issue, if you like?
A. Yes. Normally most offences are investigated where they occur.
Q. So here the alleged offences, if there were offences, were offences in the particular location of the Newcastle City Local Area Command?
A. Essentially that's why it was sent there.
Q. In your experience, is the location of particular alleged offences an important factor in determining who will investigate them?
A. It's the basic form, I suppose, that we allocate most investigations where the offence occurred. They will investigate them; but, on occasions, we'11 take on
investigations that relate to other commands. I know Georgiana investigated matters that were within other commands because that's where the persons of interest we were looking at had committed offences in other commands and we provided staff from other commands to look at those offences, but generally speaking it will go to where it occurred.
Q. So that's a first reason you identify as to why you were referring the matter to Newcastle?
A. That's the first one.
Q. Were there other reasons?
A. Yes, definitely.
Q. What was the second reason?
A. I've documented these in my subsequent report, but the issue with Lake Macquarie at that time was that there was industrial action being undertaken by our detectives, because of their staffing and workload. They had a very high workload. There was a number of staff that I believe were suffering some stress and anxiety as a result of that workload. We had just completed the Georgiana investigation. We had another one, which was a major investigation, in Strike Force Lozano, apart from the other complaint matters that we were looking at, which included homicide investigation, or investigations, one major one, and I just didn't think that we would be able to commit the necessary resources to conduct this investigation.
Q. So it's a combination of resource and welfare concerns, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Just by way of comparison, are you able to assist the Commissioner with the relative size of Lake Macquarie Local Area Command and the Newcastle City Local Area Command, perhaps in terms of number of detectives?
A. We had --
Q. Sorry, as at mid 2010?
A. At the time I think Lake Macquarie would have had in the vicinity of 20 detectives.
Q. What was the comparison with Newcastle?
A. About 30.
Q. What about just in terms of police officers generally? A. Look, very rough figures, I'd say Lake Macquarie had about 200. I'm not exactly sure on Newcastle, numbers-wise it would have been around the 300 mark.
Q. In terms of size of local area commands within New South Wales, how did Newcastle City Local Area Command rate?
A. It's the biggest command in the state.
Q. Is it in fact a conglomerate that reflects a merger of two older --
A. Yes, it was a merger of two commands of Newcastle and Waratah.
Q. When were they merged?
A. Around 2008.
Q. But as at that time I suppose, as crime manager at Lake Macquarie Local Area Command you weren't --
A. I wasn't privy to the issues with the Newcastle Local Area Command. They may have had their own staffing issues. Another thing, I was about looking after the staff at Lake Macquarie and looking at whether we could properly resource that investigation.
Q. So putting to one side the competing demands that Newcastle may well have had on their resources and you're not able to assist on that, but is it correct that it's the position of a smaller local area command referring a matter to a larger local area command, in general terms?
A. It was, but that wasn't the reason it was referred there.
Q. I understand. Can I ask you whether the matter that was being referred would otherwise have come within the terms of reference of any of the particular strike forces that you had going on at Lake Macquarie as at mid 2010? A. No, it didn't. It was a new investigation, so it didn't fall within the terms of reference of any of those existing investigations.
Q. Including Georgiana?
A. No, it didn't fall within the terms of reference of Georgiana.
Q. Do you recall how the documents were in fact forwarded
to Newcastle?
A. It would have just gone through the internal mail.
Q. So you sent it to your superintendent?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it's sent on to Newcastle?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. You addressed your report to Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler?
A. Yes, I believe so. Yes, I did.
Q. Are you able to tell us whether, other than this report, did you have any particular conversations with Detective Chief Inspector Tayler as at about the time of this report to indicate that you were sending it and so on? A. We would have - we spoke regularly about all sorts of different investigation matters that crossed the commands and definitely we would have discussed this matter.
Q. What position did Detective Chief Inspector Tayler hold at Newcastle at that time?
A. He was the crime manager at Newcastle, so the equivalent position of myself. He was actually at Lake Macquarie prior to Newcastle.
Q. As crime manager, you spoke to him regularly?
A. We spoke regularly about different investigations -
all crime issues across the Newcastle area.
Q. Do you recall having a discussion with him about these matters?
A. I don't recall a specific discussion, but we would have spoken about it, yes.
Q. Why would you have spoken about it?
A. Because I forwarded the documents to him and out of courtesy I would have told him that they were coming.
Q. Before they arrived?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall now his reaction when you spoke to him and told him that the matter was coming?
A. No, I don't.
Q. I might just ask you to go back quickly to your diary entry of 4 May and you refer there to a telephone conversation with Joanne McCarthy.
A. Yes .
Q. I won't ask you to read that on to the record. I just note, Commissioner, that there is a name there that will need to be redacted from the final version.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: Q. I might just ask you to hand that back for a minute. I think you indicated before that was a telephone conversation you had with Joanne McCarthy where she had provided certain further information.
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to ask you whether you recall, either in that conversation or a conversation at around about that time with Joanne McCarthy, any discussion that you had with her about the McAlinden material, and you making reference to Georgiana being close to finalising but having some outstanding cases, being essentially closed, and also whether you recall any discussion with Joanne McCarthy about that time where you may have indicated, "We do not envisage prosecutions about the concealment of crimes. The issues may be referred to Newcastle LAC because the events occurred in that command"?
A. No, I don't recall that. That's not the nature of this, no.
Q. When you say you don't recall it, is it your belief that you wouldn't have said words to the effect that, "We do not envisage any prosecutions about the concealment of crimes"?
A. No, definitely not, because that's on 4 May, and 3 May I've already reviewed the material and sent it to Newcastle for further investigation.
Q. Is it possible that you had such a discussion with Joanne McCarthy at an earlier point of time than 3 May in those terms, in that you may have said words to the effect that, "We do not envisage any prosecution about the concealment of crimes"?
A. No, I don't believe so. No.
Q. Why is it that you believe you didn't have a
discussion to that effect?
A. Because I hadn't formulated that view at any stage.

Certainly, I discussed with at least Paul Jacob from the previous notes issues in relation to the investigation, but that's normal to any investigation, there are always issues that you need to canvass and cover within the investigation, but definitely I hadn't made a decision that there wasn't going to be any prosecutions in relation to $i t$.
Q. If, on a hypothetical basis, you had formed such a view, is it a matter that you would have discussed with the media?
A. No, no.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because that's not generally my way of doing things. Certainly, I had some discussions with Joanne McCarthy about this matter, and I've made some notes in relation to it, but I would not have said that we weren't - didn't envisage any prosecutions.
Q. Again, either on that day or about that time, do you recall any discussion with Joanne McCarthy where she indicated that she had been contacted by a potential witness who may be able to contribute material on the knowledge of a number of clergy about the conduct of McAlinden and that that witness was uniquely placed to provide information?
A. Is that referring to my diary entry or is it --
Q. No, I'm just asking if you have a recollection of the terms of a discussion that are not in your diary entry, and I just wanted to know whether you recall that part of the discussion that you may have had with Joanne McCarthy? A. Sorry, could you repeat it?
Q. I will just repeat it: Joanne McCarthy said to you, "I have been contacted by a potential witness who may be able to contribute material on the knowledge of a number of the clergy about the misconduct of McAlinden and his defrocking; that that witness seems uniquely placed" --

MR RUSH: Can I ask my learned friend to ask these questions one at a time, because I'm becoming a little confused.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell, can you break it up so it's clearer to all the parties?

MR KELL: Yes. For clarity, I indicate that I'm looking at paragraph 12 of an affidavit of Ms McCarthy. If my friend has that, he will be able to --

MR SAIDI: Perhaps it would be beneficial if the document was put in front of him so the questions can be put in context of the statements made.

MR COHEN: I object to that course. My objection to that course is that during cross-examination of Detective Inspector Fox and other witnesses that very issue became contentious, that is to say, that it was asserted perhaps sotto voce, that this was a way of coaching or leading the witness and, in my submission, we should just maintain that course and allow the witness to recollect as best he can.

MR KELL: Commissioner, it's not appropriate for the witness to have the document of another witness. I'11 take it step by step.

THE COMMISSIONER: That should suffice, Mr Saidi.
MR SAIDI: Would you hear me on that?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR SAIDI: First of all, what was put forward by Mr Cohen I would ask you to disregard that entirely. What is being put to the witness is his response to conversations allegedly had, which are contained within I think three or four clauses of the material. It's not a case of coaching the witness or it's not a case of contaminating the witness's proposed testimony by doing it. It's asking the witness: Have a look at that conversation. Did such a conversation take place or what do you say about what was said in that conversation so as to give the witness the context and the circumstances surrounding the particular statement which was put.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi, I don't see any difficulty at this stage with the conversation being put, or digestible parts of the conversation being put to the witness to say whether or not that happened and, if he says he didn't, what he says happened. Carry on please, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: Q. Detective, do you understand this is a suggested conversation just in terms of a conversation that was had with you?
A. Yes.
Q. You may disagree as to the terms of that conversation, as you have done with the part that we've dealt with.
A. Yes.
Q. I'll just put in digestible form - and it's not a lengthy conversation that's recounted - and I'11 just ask you whether your recollection is that that formed part of the conversation that you had with Joanne McCarthy at about that time.
A. Yes.
Q. If it's not your recollection, please let us know.
A. Okay.
Q. And the fact that I'm reading it from a document doesn't mean that it's got the imprimatur of anything beyond the fact that I'm putting it to you for your consideration.
A. Understood.
Q. I'm asking whether you recall, in a conversation with Joanne McCarthy at about that time, that is to say, on or about 4 May 2010, that Joanne McCarthy had indicated to you that she had been contacted by a potential witness who may be able to contribute material on the knowledge of a number of clergy about McAlinden?
A. I've got a diary entry on 4 May which says that, yes, I did speak with Joanne McCarthy on that day and she mentioned that she had a phone call yesterday from a victim of McAlinden who did not want to pass their details on to the police at this stage, but that she believed that their details would be on the McAlinden file, we should be able to obtain those and contact the victim that way.
Q. And that she had indicated to you that the victim was uniquely placed to provide information as a victim and a person with links to the diocese?
A. I don't recall that.
Q. And that the Herald would be running more stories about senior Catholic figures and their involvement in the
events leading up to October 1995.
A. I do recall having conversations with Joanne McCarthy about the articles in the paper, because obviously we'd received a file in relation to these alleged offences which I was forwarding to Newcastle to investigate, but unfortunately, they were in the paper and everyone knew about them before we were able to actually investigate them, which was disappointing and makes our job investigatively a little bit harder.
Q. Do you recall whether Joanne McCarthy indicated to you or said to you that specifically, "We'11 be saying that the list of people who knew about McAlinden, particularly in 1995 when he was defrocked, was extensive"?
A. No, I don't recall that. I don't recall the specifics of it. I know there was conversations about the fact that if we were going to conduct investigations it would be better that it wasn't in the media prior to us conducting those investigations.
Q. Do you recall whether you made a further statement in the conversation to Joanne McCarthy, "It's difficult to prove concealment of a crime or perverting the course of justice"?
A. No, I did not say that.
Q. And you're quite sure about that?
A. Yes, the Georgiana investigation had charged people with concealed serious offences.
Q. Do you recall agreeing or stating that police would be assessing the information provided to establish what investigations would be undertaken?
A. I would have said that, yes, initially, yes, because I reviewed the material myself. I wouldn't have said it on the 4th, because I had already reviewed it on the 3rd and forwarded it to Newcastle. I didn't tell her that it would be forwarded on the 4th because it hadn't been through my commander yet.
Q. Until it had been through your commander you wouldn't be in a position to know whether or not ultimately it would be referred?
A. No, that's right.
Q. Finally, do you recall in a discussion with Joanne McCarthy indicating or suggesting that she contact Tony

Townsend, Inspector Anthony Townsend?
A. Definitely not, not at that stage, because there had been no decision made. As I said, the superintendent at Lake Macquarie hadn't actually approved my report for the matter to be sent to Newcastle and they hadn't accepted it, so I wouldn't have been telling anyone to contact Tony Townsend at that stage.
Q. Do you recall whether you yourself had had any discussions with Inspector Townsend on about that time, 4 May 2010?
A. No, I don't believe I did at that stage. I certainly had conversations with him later about that.
Q. Again, why wouldn't you have had conversations with Inspector Townsend as at that time?
A. Inspector Townsend was the region operations manager, and at this stage what we had was a complaint of a concealed serious offence, which I was referring from my command to the Newcastle command, which wasn't unusual like, regularly we take complaints of crimes and forward them on to other commands, and I don't believe it was a matter that would have been brought to the region's attention at that stage.
Q. I just want to ask you if you can identify for the Commission some further material that may have been provided by you to Newcastle following the 3 May 2010 report. I wonder if you could go to volume 1, tab 32 materials.
A. Just also in relation to that last reply, the region office and Tony Townsend would have been made aware of the complaint due to the media interest, but there would have been no discussion or referral of the matter to him as far as the investigation goes. That was straight from my command to the Newcastle command, but they would have been aware of the matter in relation to the media, so he would have been advised of it.
Q. But you have no recollection and don't believe that you spoke to Inspector Townsend about that time?
A. I spoke to him almost daily or weekly so I may have spoken to him --
Q. Not about this matter?
A. But I certainly wouldn't be referring someone else to talk to him about the matter at this stage.
Q. Tab 32, which is page 108, you'11 see this that appears to be an email from you to Detective Chief Inspector Tayler.
A. Yes .
Q. Of 7 May, so that's after your report that's annexure
C.
A. Yes.
Q. It says:

Brad
I have forwarded the file received from Joanne McCarthy of the Newcastle Herald to you, via internal mail.

That's a reference back, is it, to the report of 3 May?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Your annexure C:

These complaints should accompany this
file. They were sent directly to Shaun McLeod and one is from the victim named in the newspaper articles.

Any issues give me a call.
A. Yes.
Q. By this document you are forwarding on further information to Newcastle?
A. Correct.
Q. You'11 see at the end of that email chain on the next page there's a reference to an email from Peter Gogarty attaching two letters relating to recent media exposure. A. Yes .
Q. And asking for a mailing address be provided so that signed copies of the letter can be sent. From that context are you able to assist us as to whether the reference to those two letters are the documents that are annexures $A$ and B to your statement, being a letter from Peter Gogarty of 3 May 2010?
A. I believe that's correct, yes.
Q. And annexure A being a letter from victim [AL]?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to the next tab, tab 33, that appears to be a further email from you on 10 May 2010 providing further information to Newcastle.
A. Correct.
Q. That included information from Joanne McCarthy about a second woman - referred to as a second woman who had made a statement to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. And you forwarded that on to Newcastle on the same day as you received it from Detective McLeod, that is to say, on 10 May 2010.
A. Yes, yes, 10 May.
Q. Finally, if you go to tab 34 , there appears to be a further email that at least you've received from Detective McLeod with information relating to a particular member of the clergy and a reference in the Catholic Weekly article in 2002.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist as to whether that information would also have been forwarded on to Newcastle?
A. I assume so. I don't recall it, but looking at it, it appears to be the same email as the previous one which was forwarded.
Q. I think you may see that you may find the subject matters are a little bit different.
A. Right, yes.
Q. Do we take it that your intention would have been to forward that material on to Newcastle as well
A. Yes, definitely.
Q. In respect of those three emails, the new information that was referred to you or provided to you by Detective McLeod via Joanne McCarthy, are you able to assist as to whether any investigation at all was done by Lake Macquarie Local Area Command before the matter was forwarded?
A. Not that I'm aware of, no. It shouldn't have.
Q. Perhaps you could close that. In paragraph 10 of your statement you refer to a later telephone conversation with Joanne McCarthy on 18 August 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. She had phoned you and you indicated had inquired as to whether you had received the subject matter of the investigation back from Newcastle.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you provided us with a diary entry on page 11 of those diary entries that have been handed up that relates to 18 August. Could you just read that entry on to the record, please?
A. Yes. Joanne McCarthy Herald re McAlinden and Wilson advised sent to Detective Chief Inspector Tayler at Newcastle.
Q. If you go to Wednesday, 18 August, which may be --
A. Yes, I have that:

Joanne McCarthy, Newcastle Herald, Catholic
Church story. No comment. Not received at
this stage.
Q. What does that entry indicate to you?
A. I had contact from Joanne McCarthy asking me if I had received the investigation back. I didn't know anything about it and I told her that I hadn't received it back.
Q. The reference to "no comment"?
A. That $I$ wasn't making any comment in relation to the matter.
Q. And your reference to "not received at this stage"?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Is that a notation you've made, or is that part of a conversation you had with Joanne McCarthy?
A. No, I probably would have told her that I hadn't received it at that stage. I hadn't heard anything about it. That was the first I've heard about the investigation or some suggestion that the investigation may be returned to Lake Macquarie.

MR KELL: Commissioner, is that included in the bundle

THE COMMISSIONER: No, mine doesn't.
MR KELL: Perhaps it would be a convenient time to take morning tea and we'11 make sure those two pages are copied and made available.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR KELL: Commissioner, might I just raise one matter for the benefit of the parties interested here. There has been a request from the media for a copy of the statement of the officer which would not be provided, in any event, until after he finished giving evidence and I just ask that any party indicate by the end of lunchtime whether they have any position adverse to releasing that information.

THE COMMISSIONER: If the parties would consider that question between now and lunchtime, I would be most appreciative.

MR KELL: Commissioner, in the break, I've also had the opportunity to look at exhibit 6 , which is the diary entries, and attend to the redactions that were necessary and also to add at the end the two further pages, which is the entry of 18 August and the entry of 30 August. Could I hand up a copy of what would be a replacement to exhibit 6 ?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: Sorry, that is a copy of the proposed exhibit which will be the diary entries.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that going to be separate from the statement of Detective Inspector Wadde11?

MR KELL: Yes. I'11 tender that now.
THE COMMISSIONER: The diary entries have not yet been tendered. The diary entries of Detective Inspector Waddell suitably redacted and going from 9 April 2010 and 31 August 2010 will be admitted and marked exhibit 7.

EXHIBIT \#7 REDACTED COPY OF DIARY ENTRIES OF DETECTIVE INSPECTOR WADDELL FROM 9/4/2010 TO 31/8/10

MR KELL: Q. Detective, I think just before the break I had asked you about your diary entry of 18 August in which you refer to a telephone conversation with Joanne McCarthy.
A. Yes.
Q. You indicated that it ended with the words "not received at this stage". I think I'D asked you whether that was a notation you had made and whether it also reflected part of the conversation you had with Joanne McCarthy on 18 August --
A. Yes. That was - I recall a phone call from Joanne McCarthy asking if we had received the investigation in relation to this matter back. I hadn't heard anything about it being returned to us. That was the first I had heard of it. So I told her I hadn't received it and I didn't have any other information or any comment in relation to it.
Q. I think in your statement you indicate that you had a conversation following this with Inspector Townsend?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And Commander Rae?
A. Yes.
Q. At that stage did you come to learn that it was proposed that the investigation in fact go back to Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes, there was consideration to return it to Lake Macquarie.
Q. How were you informed about that, who told you?
A. I believe it was Tony Townsend, who was the operations manager at the Northern Region - Inspector Townsend.
Q. When did he tell you?
A. When I made contact with him after - I can't give you the specific dates, but after that conversation with Joanne McCarthy I made some inquiries and there was some suggestion it was going to be returned to Lake Macquarie and, as a result, I spoke to Tony Townsend, who was the operations manager, inspector at Northern Region, and also my commander Superintendent Rae and voiced my concerns in relation to that matter.
Q. We'11 come to that in a moment. If you could just go
to annexure D of your statement. You'11 see there are two emails there. At the bottom of the first page there is an email from you of 18 August 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. To Superintendent Rae copying in Inspector Townsend?
A. Yes.
Q. If you just turn over to the first paragraph of that document, you indicate that:

```
As you are both aware I am very
disappointed with the decision to allocate
the recent sexual assault investigation
relating to the Catholic Church to Lake
Macquarie for further investigation.
```

A. That's right.
Q. May we take it from that that you were informed on that day, that is to say, 18 August 2010, that the matter was to be at that stage referred to or returned to Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would be from a telephone conversation you had on that day with Inspector Townsend?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you chose to take swift action.
A. I've discussed the issue with both he and

Superintendent Rae and I formulated that email to document my concerns.
Q. In that first paragraph you indicate:

I am aware that Inspector Townsend is going to forward me the hard copy of the file and discuss further, but $I$ feel compelled to voice my dissatisfaction with this decision.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can I ask you whether you in fact later received the hard copy of the file?
A. No, I never received the file back.
Q. Then I think in this document you set out various reasons as to why in your view it was not appropriate for the matter to be referred back to Lake Macquarie?
A. That's correct.
Q. Effectively, they echo the reasons you've given in evidence here today about resources - you are nodding?
A. Yes, resources, staffing, workload and welfare concerns in relation to the staff within the detectives' office at Lake Macquarie.
Q. In the second-1ast paragraph on that page you indicate your view:
... this investigation relates to Newcastle
City and Hunter Valley and has nothing to
do with Lake Macquarie and based on our
available resources we are not in a
position to provide an adequate
investigation of this matter.
A. That's correct. I didn't think we had the resources to dedicate a number of officers to this investigation at that time.
Q. On the first page you attach also an email of 25 August from Inspector Townsend to Inspector Fay Dunn. A. Yes .
Q. Who is Inspector Dunn?
A. She was the staff officer at the Northern Region at that time.
Q. Had you received a copy of that email - were you copied on this email at the time?
A. No, I don't believe so. I don't recall seeing it previously.
Q. When you say you don't recall seeing it previously before?
A. Prior to my interview and evidence at the private inquiry - private Commission. It just seems to be an email discussing resourcing issues across the region.
Q. Can I ask when did you become aware that the matter had in fact been referred to Newcastle after you had sent
your email of 18 August?
A. I don't actually recall.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. Was it shortly after you had sent your email, or a
number of weeks?
A. I'd be guessing. I don't recall. I know I later
learned a decision had been made for it to go to Newcastle,
but when that was specifically I don't recall.
Q. Do you remember who told you?
A. No, I don't. I would expect it would be Inspector
Townsend or Superintendent Rae, but I don't actually
recal 1.
Q. In your statement you refer to a conversation that you
had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox on 31 August. This
is in paragraph 12.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you make a diary entry of that conversation,
which is on the last page of those diary entries.
A. Yes. I haven't got that with me now, but it was. I
don't have a copy of the diary entry.
Q. If you just assume that it says:
Peter Fox re McAlinden and Catholic Church
matter.
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to ask you very quick1y whether you recall
any further things about that conversation with Detective
Fox. First, was it a conversation by phone?
A. It would have been a conversation by phone, yes.
Q. You indicate in your statement that you advised him
that Lake Macquarie had not received the investigation back
and it was your belief that it wasn't going to be
investigated by Lake Macquarie?
A. That's right.
Q. Do you recall in any part of that conversation - and
you are allowed to say "Yes" or "No" - I just want to ask
whether you recall in any part of that conversation that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had asked whether the matter was going to be investigated because he had been told by Shaun McLeod that the matter was only going to be reviewed and not investigated?
A. No, I don't recall that.
Q. And, when you indicate you don't recall, do you have any belief as to whether or not it was said?
A. That it was said that it was only going to be reviewed and not investigated?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I don't believe that was said.
Q. Why is that?
A. I don't recall it being said.
Q. Do you think if it had been said, you would recall?
A. Look, I don't recall the actual conversation. I've got a note in my diary that the call was made inquiring as to whether we had received it back, but I don't actually recall the conversation.
Q. Finally, Detective Chief Inspector Fox had told sorry, that you had told him that you had sent the documents and reports to the region office and believed it was going to be looked at by Detective Steel at the Newcastle command?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. No. I had sent the documents to Newcastle.
Q. Yes. When you say "No" you've got no recollection --
A. Originally I sent the documents to Newcastle. I
didn't know who was investigating it and I don't recall, as
I said before, when I was told that Newcastle were actually going to be doing the investigation.

MR KELL. Thank you, detective.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR RUSH:

MR RUSH: Q. Officer Wadde11, might you have a look in that bundle number 1 again - that's the exhibit bundle 1 at tab 38. You'11 see - it should be on page 141 - that
that is an email from Officer Jacob to Officer Tayler apparently of 20 May. Do you have that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. In the second-last paragraph it says this:

Would you please contact him re this matter. From what I understand from Dave Waddell, although this inquiry/assessment may have to be handled with diplomacy there is no prospect of any criminal investigation outcomes as key persons (ie the offender and decision maker within the church) are both deceased.
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree that that conversation attributed to you with Officer Jacob by Officer Jacob is broadly reflective of the effect of the conversation that you set out in that email - that you had with Officer Jacob; the conversation you had with Officer Jacob is broadly the conversation that is set out in that email in terms of its effect?
A. We had a conversation - I can't remember the date now, but it was during April or May in relation to that matter and we discussed some issues in respect of the investigation and some impediments to it and obviously the deceased persons were one of the issues with it.
Q. Do you agree that it is broadly reflective of the conversation that you had with Officer Jacob?
A. Broadly - yes, broadly.
Q. And, indeed, that you had told Officer Jacob at some stage in the lead-up to 20 May that the investigation needed to be handled with diplomacy.
A. No.
Q. Did you have a good working relationship with Officer Jacob?
A. We didn't work directly together, but there were no issues before us. I spoke to him in relation to a number of investigations over time.
Q. Can you think of any reason why Officer Jacob might have made that remark?
A. Because we had only had a brief conversation on the phone in relation to this investigation and discussed some issues. The original conversation $I$ had with him was in relation to whether they would be able to provide any - or whether they would be able to undertake or take on the investigation and they weren't in a position at that point in time and we broadly discussed the specifics of the investigation.
Q. Might you have simply forgotten the specifics of the conversation?
A. I don't think so.
Q. But you're not sure?
A. I don't believe - I don't recall the specifics of the conversation at all. I've only got my diary note in relation to the conversation.
Q. And your diary note doesn't record that detail, does it?
A. It records --
Q. I withdraw that question. Do you recall telling Officer Jacob that there is no prospect of any criminal investigation outcomes as key persons, ie, the offender and the decision maker within the church are both deceased?
A. No. No. I recall telling him that both persons were deceased, but we hadn't conducted any investigation in relation to the complaint at that stage. That was a problem in relation to the investigation that would have to be considered during the course of it.
Q. By 20 May had you read the documents that comprised the complaint?
A. Yes, I had perused the documents. I reviewed them and I forwarded them to Newcastle for further investigation on 3 May.
Q. When you answered earlier that you were in broad agreement as to the effect of the conversation, what broad agreement --

THE COMMISSIONER: Broadly reflective, Mr Rush.
MR RUSH: Q. When you indicated earlier that it was broadly reflective of the conversation, what aspects of the bits I've read were broadly reflective from your memory?
A. That we had a discussion in relation to the investigation and there were some issues in relation to the fact that some of the key persons were deceased.
Q. Can I refer you to your diary note of 30 April, and this is on page 5 I think of exhibit 6.
A. Yes.
Q. In that you note that McAlinden and Clark are deceased?
A. Correct.
Q. And "Wilson and Malone reasonable excuse".
A. Correct.
Q. Does that assist you in your memory of the conversation that you had with Jacob, and particularly the assertion apparently made by Jacob in that email that you said those words that he attributes to you?
A. Yes, they were the problems with that investigation.
Q. Might it have been, given your notation in the diary, that in fact that is exactly what you had told Officer Jacob; that is, that the matter would need to be handled with diplomacy and that there was no prospect of any criminal investigation outcomes, as key persons were deceased?
A. No. What was discussed was that there were some issues in relation to the investigation, but definitely not that there was no prospect at all of any outcomes.
Q. Does it concern you that Officer Jacob would have made that comment and that the investigation might have proceeded with your comments recalled in that way by him? A. I think the outcome of the investigation couldn't be predetermined. I mean, the investigation had to take its course, so we conducted the investigation to find the truth of the matter and, until that investigation takes place, in the planning stages, obviously we consider some of the constraints and impediments to any investigation, so we address those within the course of the investigation.
Q. Does it concern you, though, that Officer Jacob might have continued in his role in the investigation labouring under his apprehension that that was your view?

MR SAIDI: I object.

MR RUSH: I withdraw the question.
Q. I put to you, Officer Waddell, that you in fact told Officer Jacob that the matter would need to be handled with diplomacy.
A. No.
Q. I put to you that you told Officer Jacob that there was no prospect of any criminal investigation outcomes, as key persons - the offender and the decision maker - were both deceased?
A. No, not that there were no prospects of any criminal outcomes - that they were issues to be canvassed within the investigations.
Q. Would you agree with me that there was concern broadly within those investigating the complaints and those that had supervision of them, including yourself, about the role of the media?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner I object. Bearing in mind this witness's local area command was not involved in an investigation, it is not correct to assert to him that there was an investigation which had concerns in relation to the media. The investigation was carried out by a later local area command, not his - he has made it clear there was no investigation by him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can you rephrase the question, Mr Rush?
MR RUSH: I can make it more confined perhaps.
Q. You were concerned, were you not, about statements that may have been made by officers investigating the matter to the Newcastle Herald?
A. Yes.

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, he was concerned about Mr McLeod being concerned. McLeod was not investigating the matter. It needs to be more accurate than what is being put about "officers investigating the matter". McLeod was not, or if he was, he was doing it without the knowledge of this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is it Mr McLeod that you are referring to, Mr Rush?

MR RUSH: It is, and he had been handed the documents and that might be the issue. I'll simply put it again.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
MR RUSH: Q. Were you concerned about the media's involvement with the officers that had a role to play in the carriage of the complaint?
A. I was concerned about Shaun McLeod's involvement and his relationship with the media and the fact that this complaint was already in the media prior to the investigation.
Q. Would you agree with me that the media's involvement was embarrassing for the local area command?
A. No, not at all. I don't think it's embarrassing in any way. I think it was unfortunate that it was in the media prior to the matter being investigated, because it just makes the investigation - poses more problems to the investigation. Ideally, you want to conduct an investigation and people not be aware that you are conducting an investigation until you get to the stage where you wish to speak to those persons. So it made the investigation harder - or it would have made the investigation harder.
Q. It wasn't a pleasant experience, though, for individual officers to be referred to in the media in terms of the way in which they were carrying out their duties? A. There was no adverse criticism, I don't think, at that stage that was any concern to the police involved.
Q. Why then was McLeod chastised for his involvement with the media if, at the end of the day, there was nothing to be concerned about?

MR KELL: I object.
MR SAIDI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: You may tell me your objections, Mr Kell. I think I understand them.

MR KELL: The term "chastise" is pejorative and is not going to assist. Also, this area of inquiry may not be of much assistance to the Commissioner as well; whether or not
there was a particular chastisement of Detective McLeod in relation to the conduct with the media may not be of much assistance to the matters at which you are looking at in terms of terms of reference No. 1.

THE COMMISSIONER: Does that reflect your objection, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: I don't have an objection, Commissioner. I wish to be heard on that proposition.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi also had an objection.
MR SAIDI: I don't want to take up time, Commissioner. I adopt what was previously said.

MR COHEN: My concern is this, Commissioner. It is put by my learned friend Mr Kell, and adopted by Mr Saidi, that this can't assist you. The term of reference is about matters that impeded expressly Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Having regard to the definitions contained within the terms of reference, it does connote indirect matters that may go off at a tangent and that cannot have some probative value for your purposes. Attempts to shut down what would occur - that approach, in my respectful submission, would be a misstep subject to the question being properly informed or without other objection. The relevant objection is a little bit too conservative, if I may put it that way, in my respectful submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Rush, I will permit you to put it without the pejorative "chastise" and see how we go.

MR RUSH: Do you want to hear me on the question of relevance or --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Rush.
MR RUSH: I can certainly amend the pejorative term; that's not an issue. The relevance we assert is this: it may be in the course of this Commission and this inquiry that a lot of interest has been on the assertions of, if you like, cover-up of cover-up - cover-up of the suggestion that matters of concealment weren't investigated. But if the Commission, at the end of the day, is left with evidence that the investigation did go at some stage off the rails but doesn't come to a view that there was
essentially a cover-up of a cover-up, it will assist the Commission to know what did happen. What is the rational explanation for why an investigation went off the rails.

> It may be my submission at the conclusion of the evidence taken by the Commission that a mix of the legislation and its understanding, a mix of the way in which the police dealt with the media, and particularly the police's understanding of investigative journalism essentially, a mix of resourcing, a mix of experience, a mix of miscommunication, led to the result which gave the impression of a more serious set of circumstances, but in fact provides a rational explanation for precisely what occurred.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Rush. Perhaps you could ask your question again and we will see how we go.

MR RUSH: Q. Officer Wadde11, do you accept that Officer McLeod was partially sanctioned, in part, because of the way he dealt with the media?
A. I spoke to Detective McLeod on one occasion in relation to making a media release without authorisation. That was the only time that he was reprimanded or sanctioned in any way and it was only a matter of telling him that he needed to speak to me before he came to me and told me about it. That was a media release in relation to an arrest. That was the only time that has been reprimanded or sanctioned in relation to the media as far as I'm concerned. The other concerns were in relation to him speaking to persons and receiving complaints and not recording them or reporting them up.
Q. If we can deal with that issue of the way in which Officer McLeod was dealt with, in your evidence you indicated that there were a number of simple things that he had not done correctly, as I understand it.
A. Was that in relation to the arrest on 9 April?
Q. The arrest, and I think there was a comment or reference made about a car as well - the organisation of a car?
A. Yes, there were a number of issues.
Q. Do you remember that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you referred to it as "simple things"; by that did you mean little things?
A. Little things, yes.
Q. Wasn't it the annoyance about his contact with the media that was the overwhelming reason for getting him out of the matter?
A. What do you mean "getting him out of the matter"?
Q. Having the matter reassigned from him.
A. Which matter?

MR SAIDI: I object. I don't think the matter was ever assigned to him, with respect. This is proceeding on a wrong premise.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Rush, that is true, isn't it?
MR RUSH: If the Commission would just excuse me for one moment. Sorry, I'11 withdraw the question and ask this instead.
Q. He wanted to be involved in this investigation, didn't he?
A. The complaint in relation to?
Q. The concealments.
A. Yes.
Q. You were concerned that he not be involved in that investigation.
A. I was concerned that - to take Shaun McLeod of this investigation I'd referred to Newcastle, because I didn't believe that we should be doing it. It wasn't about an individual officer.
Q. Can I suggest to you that one of the reasons he was not assigned to investigate the matter was because of concerns you had about his contact with the media?
A. No, that wasn't the reason. Shaun McLeod took the report of this matter, it was forwarded to him. Like any crime, the officer taking the report is not necessarily the person who investigates it particularly if it's not being investigated by that command.
Q. Officer Waddel1, were you concerned about the reputation of senior clergy in circumstances where, in your
view, those clergy had made efforts to improve their church's practices with dealing with matters of this nature?
A. I'm sorry, I was concerned about?
Q. You were concerned about the reputation of senior clergy in the church in circumstances where, in your view, those clergy had made efforts to improve church practices.
A. I don't know that I would be concerned about their reputations, no. It wasn't a matter for my consideration.
Q. I ask you to have a look at a document at tab 30A.
A. Yes. That's my statement.
Q. If you could turn to the next page, page $105(\mathrm{~d})$, the third last paragraph.
A. Yes.
Q. You note there:

The current Bishop of Newcastle Maitland diocese of the Catholic Church, Bishop Michael Malone has public7y acknowledged victims of the Catholic Church, including those of Father McAlinden. He has further made public comment that he could have handled matters of sexual assault better. Bishop Malone has cooperated fully with the investigation of Strike Force Georgiana, as did Zimmerman House, a child protection unit of the Maitland-Newcastle Diocese of the Catholic Church, established by Bishop Michael Malone. Since these reports the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference has developed "Towards Healing", a comprehensive policy and procedure for dealing with abuse allegations.

How, if you weren't concerned for the reputation of the clergy involved, was that relevant to the investigation in your mind?

MR SAIDI: I object, and additionally it's an unfair question. Perhaps the witness could be directed towards the last sentence of the next paragraph where this witness indicates the matter is referred for further - any further investigation. With respect, he is misleading the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi, the witness is aware of his document and is now reminded of that part, so $I$ will permit him to answer the question. Thank you.
Q. Inspector, are you able to answer that question?
A. Yes, can you repeat it.

MR RUSH: Q. Given what you've said in that third-last paragraph, how do you say that the matters that you have set out there were relevant to the investigation in your mind?
A. They were relevant because Bishop Malone would become a person of interest in the investigation and the fact that we had had dealings with him and the nature of those dealings would be relevant consideration for the subsequent investigation.
Q. You wrote that, didn't you, because you thought it was relevant to the investigation?
A. Yes, it is relevant, and relevant --
Q. How do you say it is relevant?
A. Because it gives some background as to the nature of our dealings with him as to how he may have reacted or been dealt with during the course of the investigation.
Q. Would you agree with me that those matters are properly matters that would be dealt with in mitigation of any finding?

MR SAIDI: I object to the question. It's too broad, too indefinite and too uncertain.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it is, Mr Rush, I agree - it is speculative.

MR RUSH: Perhaps I don't need to take it any further. It is really a matter for submissions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
MR RUSH: Q. In evidence-in-chief you were directed to a conversation with Joanne McCarthy of 4 May 2010. I might just go through that with you again.
A. Yes.
Q. I put to you that, in a conversation with Joanne McCarthy of 4 May 2010, you told Joanne McCarthy Georgiana is finalising some outstanding cases but it is essentially closed.
A. That would be potentially correct, yes. That was the status of Georgiana at that stage.
Q. And you told her: We do not envisage any prosecutions about the concealment of crimes.
A. We actually did charge someone with a concealed serious offence, but in relation to this matter we weren't going to investigate it further. On 3 May I had already referred this matter on to Newcastle, so prior to that conversation, so Georgiana wasn't going to investigate any further offences in relation to this matter, no.
Q. This matter was the principal matter, that is, the strike that became Strike Force Lantle was the one charged with investigating principally the concealment of crimes? A. Later, yes.
Q. Indeed, the material that was the base for the commencement of that operation or strike force had been provided to you.
A. Yes .
Q. Can I put it to you that what you said to Joanne McCarthy was that you did not envisage any prosecutions about the concealment of crimes.
A. Not in relation to that investigation, because that investigation hadn't even commenced.
Q. Are you saying that you might have said that, but in relation to Georgiana?
A. I may have said that Georgiana wasn't going to
investigate the concealment of any crimes although we had actually charged someone with a concealment offence.
Q. As a result of that investigation - Georgiana?
A. Yes, as a result of the Georgiana investigation, but we weren't investigating any further matters of concealment at that stage.
Q. That you further said to Joanne McCarthy:

The issues may be referred to Newcastle
Local Area Command because the events
occurred in that command.
A. I potentially may have said that. That's the file I completed the prior day.
Q. That Joanne McCarthy had said to you:

I have been contacted by a potential
witness who may be able to contribute
material on the knowledge of a number of
clergy about the misconduct of Denis McAlinden and his defrocking.
A. I don't recall that, but $I$ do have a diary note in my diary in relation to her stating that she had spoken to another witness but they didn't want to provide their details at this stage but we would be able to obtain them from the original McAlinden file, so $I$ made a note of that.
Q. So it is possible that that was what was said by Joanne McCarthy to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And that she further went on to say:

She seems uniquely placed to provide information as a victim and a person with links to the diocese.

Do you agree that that was something that Joanne McCarthy said to you on that occasion?
A. I don't recall that.
Q.

The Herald will be running more stories about senior Catholic figures and their involvement in the months leading up to October 1995.
A. Again, I don't recall that, but $I$ know at some stage I don't know what date - that I did have some discussions with Joanne McCarthy about the fact that the media coverage wouldn't help the investigation.
Q. And specifically, going on again, what I'm suggesting to you is that these are words said by Joanne McCarthy to you in that call of 4 May:

Specifically, we will be saying that the list of people who knew about McAlinden, particularly in 1995 when he was defrocked, was extensive, includes current Bishop Michael Malone and goes beyond the Maitland-Newcastle diocese.
A. I don't recall specifically that.
Q. But it could have been said?
A. It could have been said.
Q. Do you recall saying to Joanne McCarthy, again in this conversation of 4 May:

I feel sorry for Michael Malone in this. He has been supportive of the police during our investigations so far.
A. No, I don't recall saying I felt sorry for him. I may have said he's been supportive during our current investigations, because he had been quite forthcoming with us in assisting with Strike Force Georgiana.
Q. And that Joanne McCarthy had said:

I agree and I've spoken to him and written about his leadership on this issue in the last couple of years. But he is also a representative of a church which has betrayed many people.

Do you recall Joanne McCarthy --
A. No, I don't recall it.
Q. Might it have been said?
A. It could have been. I don't recall it.
Q. I put to you that it was?
A. I don't recall it.
Q. You said:

It's difficult to prove concealment of a crime or perverting the course of justice.
A. No, I didn't say it's difficult to prove it. Obviously we had charged people under Georgiana with conceal offences.
Q. I put to you that it was said.
A. I don't recall saying that, no.
Q. Joanne McCarthy then said:

I accept that. But based on the documents alone, putting aside the number of witnesses who will provide statements ...

I withdraw that question.
Officer Waddell, I came earlier to the document at tab 30A.
A. Yes.
Q. And the third-last paragraph of that document. Just by way of clarification, there is a date of 3 May at the top of that document. Under your signature on page 2, there is a date of 19 April 2010. Is that just a typo, or was that the date you drafted it but it was actually sent a couple of weeks later?
A. No. That's a typo. It's obviously from a previous report on the same macro.

MR RUSH: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Rush. Mr Cohen?
<EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:
MR COHEN: Q. Chief inspector, in your daily activities as a police officer you consider yourself to conduct your daily affairs in a careful and precise way?
A. I try to, yes.
Q. In the conduct and discharge of those daily duties, you exhibit that care and attention to detail for those of whom you are the leader?
A. Yes, I try.
Q. Is it your practice to record all matters of importance or significance to you in that daily discharge of duties in writing?
A. I try to record things in writing, yes, but it depends on again how busy you are, whether you actually do get the time to record things in detail or not just depends on the day.
Q. Pressure of work might lead you to letting something slip through?
A. Definitely.
Q. Is the only source of such recording your diary that has been referred to, exhibit 7?
A. There are diary entries, sit reps and other memoranda and correspondence.
Q. Sit reps are a formal system entry, are they not?
A. Correct.
Q. They get a document number of some unique type?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. Are they a TRIM system entry or another system?
A. It's another system.
Q. The other documents you are referring to, do you mean such as the materials that are provided to you via senior Detective Constable McLeod from Joanne McCarthy, to which you referred a moment ago in your answer?
A. Yes.
Q. It's the case, isn't it, for the sake of the Commissioner's understanding of daily practice, for officers of your rank and above - and you are the first level of commissioned officer?
A. Yes.
Q. So commissioned officers, inspectors of that rank and above have the heavy, if not universal, and sole reliance upon the diary for the purposes of recordings?
A. I think some commissioned officers will use duty books or some would usually use duty books, but I don't, I keep a diary.
Q. The bulk of people, in your understanding and experience, of a commissioned rank tend not to use duty books for such reports?
A. Some still use duty books as a matter of course.
Q. Perhaps very old hands might use a duty book; otherwise it is a diary issued by the department?
A. Yes.
Q. Those diaries are logged and kept in a systemic way by the Police Force?
A. No, individual officers keep their own diaries.
Q. At liberty to do with them what they will?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what you do?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it possible for members of the public to get a look at the diary?
A. No.
Q. How can you be sure?
A. Because I keep it with me.
Q. At all times?
A. Either in the office or in my bag at home, yes.
Q. Have you ever lost a diary?
A. No.
Q. Never, ever?
A. No.
Q. In respect of the statement that you have given and has been admitted into evidence, was it prepared by you?
A. The statement?
Q. Yes.
A. I was conferenced with the solicitors representing.

The statement was prepared during that conference. It was then forwarded to me and I went through it, made any alterations, signed it and returned it.
Q. When did that process start?
A. When?
Q. Yes.
A. I haven't got the exact date here. I signed the statement on 18 March though.
Q. When did the process start?
A. I haven't got the date here with me.
Q. Don't you say in your statement in paragraph 2 that you were served with a summons on 16 March - is that not in your statement?
A. Correct.
Q. So all of this was in two days flat, was it?
A. I'd have to check the dates. I can't tell you the dates without referring to my diary. As I said, it would be in my diary.
Q. I think more than two days surely.

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object to this type of question. I object on the basis of relevance. Unless there is a reason for taking --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, is there a reason? It may not take longer than three days to deal with if someone is concentrating. What does that have to do with matters?

MR KELL: I might just indicate, Commissioner, that the potential reference to a summons on 16 March is probably inadvertently misleading in the sense that the summons is a vehicle by which the Commission is able to effectively compel or obtain production of a statement under a process envisaged by the Act, so it's not a necessary indicator that a statement was prepared within two days.

THE COMMISSIONER: Detective Inspector Wadde11 may we11 have known that he would be possibly giving evidence before me well before that date; is that right?

MR KELL: It's possible, Commissioner, yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the question may be misconceived in that the summons does not necessarily indicate the first day upon which the witness may have become aware of the need to complete the statement.

MR COHEN: My question was founded upon the apparent chronology of the statement. I have my answer, but it seems extraordinary it was done within two days.

MR SAIDI: Could I ask my friend to keep his comments
about what is extraordinary to himself rather than say it in this arena. If he wants to make a statement, let him make it at the end of the day and not now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR COHEN: Q. A crime manager - which is your position for about the last six years, is it not --
A. Correct.
Q. -- has a diverse range of tasks to discharge on a daily basis; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. It's first, possibly foremost, as you told the Commissioner, in your view, a strategic management position; is that right?
A. Yes, that is the first role.
Q. That's the first role?
A. Well, it's the overriding role. On a day-to-day basis, it's certainly not the first role.
Q. Could you just explain to the Commissioner if it's not the overriding role, what then is the first role?
A. We have a responsibility for the strategic management of crime within the command, which includes the volume crime and proactive strategies to address those crimes as well as preventive-type measures, but we are also responsible for the management of major investigations and serious crime and major crime.
Q. I take it that conceptually the reason why you get up to come on to work each day, having regard to the fact that you are the crime manager, is the incentive of reduction of crime; is that a way fair of putting it?
A. Correct.
Q. The less the better?
A. Yes.
Q. In the ideal world, you would like to see yourself out of a job; is that the case?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Would you call crime reduction a critical strategy?
A. Crime reduction is a strategy, yes.
Q. But a critical strategy - that sort of active emphasis I'm putting on it, would you call it that?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Would the strategy, as you put it, of crime reduction include developing what $I$ would describe as a hierarchy of needs such as deciding whether it was better to reduce the number of armed robberies in a local area command rather than focusing on perhaps the number of vandalising wheelie bins.

MR KELL: I object, Commissioner. I'm not sure questions of this nature are going to assist the Commission. At the moment it is difficult to see the relevance of this witness being asked about the strategies to do with armed robbery.

MR COHEN: I can say that I have a forensic purpose and -THE COMMISSIONER: Do you, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: I do.
THE COMMISSIONER: Will we get to it fairly presently?
MR COHEN: I need to work through a series of propositions to do that.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Mr Cohen, I'11 permit you to do that.

MR COHEN: I'm not sure I understand what the concern about that is.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not inquiring into the general duties of the crime managers in New South Wales and what they are aiming at every day, but --

MR COHEN: No. You are inquiring into what impeded a crime manager. In my submission, to understand properly what the crime manager's position is or is not, you need to be informed about what the conduct of that role is, and that's what I'm endeavouring to elucidate from someone who is expressly in the job as we speak. That's my purpose, but I apprehend, unless I'm terribly wrong about this --

THE COMMISSIONER: You may continue, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. You didn't answer the previous question.
You want to focus on reducing serious crime not petty crime I take it?
A. Reducing all crime.
Q. But presumably serious crime is a crime rather than a petty crime such as vandalising a wheelie bin?
A. That would depend on the crime environment and the types of crimes being committed.
Q. You as crime manager and your ilk would provide key advice in formulating the strategy for crime reduction. That must be right?
A. Yes.
Q. Having formulated it, the crime manager also has control over the implementation of that policing policy as part of the local area command's strategy?
A. Oversight and managing it, yes.
Q. The crime manager would keep that policy, having been designed and implemented, under constant review?
A. Yes, we --
Q. It's an ongoing --
A. We continually monitor trends and --
Q. It's an ongoing process. You don't take your eye off the ball. Having produced the policy, you make sure it works; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. A further task and another one of the tasks, a procedural or daily practice task, is the crime manager manages the crime management unit within the LAC; is that so?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Your concern is that the crime management unit then reports efficiently to you?
A. All sections should be working efficiently ideally.
Q. Is it your experience that it is enough just to be behind a desk to understand that the crime management unit operates efficiently or do you need to get out in the field from time to time?

MR SAIDI: Could I object. About 10 questions ago, my friend used the phrase for legitimate forensic purpose or relevance of these line of questions. Ten questions later it's certainly been made clear to me, although I must say it may just be me, but it doesn't appear to be relevant at this stage.

THE COMMISSIONER: I gather the questions aren't directed to whether a crime manager may at times get his or her hands dirty on investigative matters.

MR COHEN: That's it in a nutshell.
THE COMMISSIONER: I'11 permit it for another couple of questions, perhaps not 10, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. You heard what the Commissioner said. Do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you get out in the field?
A. Sometimes, yes - more so for major events or major investigations and operations, yes.
Q. Those major events you described earlier in your evidence, were they events that relate to some sorts of issues like a critical incident where a police operation had gone wrong and someone had been hurt?
A. That would be one.
Q. That's all you said in answer to the questions from my friend Mr Kell. You didn't identify anything else. Why was that?

MR SAIDI: I object. Look, it was put by Mr Kell the critical incident - not by the witness. Mr Kell described it as "such as critical incidents". It's really unfair to suggest that this witness didn't put it forward when it was the questioner who indicated it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it was put forward by Mr Kell, but I think that the witness was unable to think of any other situations in which he would be involved in investigations himself. Is that your recollection of the course of the evidence, Mr Kell?

MR KELL: I'm not certain it was limited specifically, but the questions were in the context at that time as I recall of having a substantive investigative role rather than and there may be a difference between that and going out and doing certain things in the field. I think in fairness to the witness, that distinction may need to be explored.

MR COHEN: I'11 do just that.
MR KELL: There may be an important difference between the two.

THE COMMISSIONER: The difference between going into the field to supervise --

MR KELL: To make a single observation about something versus having a substantive role in an investigative matter.

MR COHEN: Q. You heard that exchange. What do you define as a critical incident?
A. A critical incident?
Q. That was your term?
A. A critical incident is where a police officer is killed or injured during the course of a police operation and a police officer is assigned as the chief investigating officer in relation to those matters. That would be the only time that I would foresee a crime manager being hands on actually interviewing persons other than a complaint investigation. In relation to other major operations or investigations, we are certainly out there leading, managing, but we are not hands on investigating. That was the articulation that $I$ was making.
Q. To understand that so there is no misunderstanding, because these are conceptually somewhat difficult concepts or issues, are you limiting the idea to a critical incident where you would become personally involved? You wouldn't become involved in anything beyond that defined area of critical incident; is that right?
A. You mean in relation to --
Q. Anything else. The fact that there is no officer killed on duty or injured badly in some sort of operation, absent that, would you be involved --
A. Involved all the time.
Q. I'm sorry, I don't mean as a supervisor, I mean actively involved yourself doing some of the tasks at the coal face?
A. Generally speaking, yes.
Q. Do you agree that part of the role is leading and directing complex sensitive investigations as required?
A. Yes .
Q. That's not limited to critical incidents, is it? A. No.
Q. Then why do you impose this factor of critical incidents to leading and directing complex sensitive investigations?
A. Because, as I said before, that's the only scenario where I can see where, as a crime manager - that and a complaint investigation - I would be physically interviewing or taking versions from a witness, person of interest or another officer. In relation to a homicide or any other major investigation, $I$ would be out in the field managing and leading particularly in relation to crime scenes, but $I$ won't be conducting interviews with persons of interest and taking witness statements.
Q. When you say "out in the field managing and leading", do you mean when something occurs you are called and you attend the scene to look at what's going on?
A. That's correct.
Q. But not to be involved in any form of investigation of that scene either at the time or subsequently?
A. No. Essentially the role is leading and managing.
Q. Leadership is about leading from the front, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to the Commissioner how it is you could lead a team if you are not there at the front from time to time?
A. You are there at the front from time to time particularly in relation to major operations and investigations. The distinction that is being drawn is when you are actually involved taking statements and interviewing. That was the distinction that was made.
Q. You say you are leading from the front, but aren't you up in the heights looking over the back field rather than actually being involved in the day-to-day events?
A. To some extent, yes.
Q. Does that not run the risk of leading you to a position where you think you know what's going on from day to day, but you don't actually know because you are not getting your hands dirty?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. To use a terrible word, are you intellectualising this process and thinking about what is so but not knowing what is so?
A. I believe I know what's so within my command.
Q. But not at the coalface - not from direct experience at the coalface; is that right?
A. Yes, from being at the coalface. All I'm saying is that I'm not involved in the actual investigation, in interviewing victims, witnesses and offenders.
Q. So if the terrible situation arose that you were being fed a story by a direct report rather than the facts, would you know, could you know?
A. Yes, I review interviews, I review statements, I review proofs of evidence regularly. I sit and watch interviews.
Q. That's not quite what I asked. If you were being given a self-serving position by a subordinate to avoid some miscalculation, for example, could you ever really know that was the case?
A. I should do, yes.
Q. You should do, but could you know given that you weren't there from time to time, to use the phrase again, if I may, getting your hands dirty?
A. I think I would be in a better position having an overriding view and drilling down where need be than to be taking my time interviewing witnesses or offenders or victims.
Q. Let me ask you this then, and I understand the proposition you are putting --
A. If you are putting to me I should be out investigating, no, that's not the role.
Q. No, I wasn't putting that to you and lest there be any misunderstanding between us, let me clarify what I was putting. I was asking you: can you be sure, in the unfortunate case that a subordinate was feeding you misinformation, or trying to avoid it becoming obvious to you having made a mistake which they were desperate for you to avoid becoming aware of, if they did that, you are not there say 10 or 15 per cent of the time to have an idea, can you be satisfied in your own mind you could be sure they weren't spinning you a line as opposed to giving you the truth?

MR KELL: I object to the question on a number of bases, but the pejorative term, the reference to spinning a line, but, Commissioner, I'm not sure you are going to be assisted by continual questioning along these lines.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kel1. Mr Cohen, perhaps no-one can be 100 per cent sure of their staff at all times.

MR COHEN: I appreciate that.
THE COMMISSIONER: I have been assisted by the evidence as it's fallen. Perhaps we could move on to another area.

MR COHEN: Is that a convenient time? I can move to another topic. I don't want to get to it and leave it, as it were, pregnant in the moment. Is that a convenient moment.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will resume on time, I trust.

## LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, $I$ have an application to make if it's convenient to deal with it now. It's come to our attention that some items have been tweeted in the last 12 hours. If I can hand up a copy of the document. I have one more spare copy if anyone else needs it. Can I refer you, Commissioner, to the first document - what appears to be a tweet. It's under the name of Peter Fox, Peter_Fox59 - and you will see the contents yourself. If I can indicate in the bottom right-hand corner of the
document it shows the time of 1.03 pm . The tweet I'm referring to shows 28 minutes. On my understanding, Commissioner, what that indicates is that the actual tweet itself occurred at somewhere around about the 12.35 pm mark. One takes away the 28 minutes from 1.03.

THE COMMISSIONER: Whilst we were sitting in this courtroom.

MR SAIDI: Yes, Commissioner.
(Commission adjourned temporarily)

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MR SAIDI: I was making an application before that short break, Commissioner, relating to some tweets brought to our attention during the course of the luncheon break. I handed out a document and I trust you got a copy of that document, Commissioner. The top entry in relation to the tweet appears to be from Peter Fox and the identification is Peter_Fox59. One has reason to believe that that, in fact, relates to Mr Peter Fox, who gave evidence during the course of these proceedings. The tweet itself appears to indicate that it was sent or tweeted at 12.35 pm , which was at a point of time when the court was in session or the Commission was in session and prior to the break that occurred.

There is a second tweet, which is the third tweet down, by Mr Dan Cox, which is in similar terms or rather not too dissimilar terms from that which is the top tweet. That refers to the Commission hearing evidence from a Detective Inspector Dave Waddell and it refers to him being a cop that Mr Fox told "him to stop investigating." When one goes to the tweet by Mr Fox, the tweet is:

Detective Inspector Waddell gives evidence that in May 2010 he was closing down Strike Force Georgiana investigating child sex abuse by Hunter clergy.

By way of background, I think I can say that in the context of the clients who I represent - the individual police officer who, you would know, enjoy a very high rank been the NSW Police Force and who, for the greater part if not the entirety of proceedings up to now, including the
pre-Commission hearing days, have maintained a complete and absolute dignified silence in relation to the allegations being made - they are most distressed at the prospect that what appears to be false information, which is not reflective of the evidence that has been given in this court and indeed is at odds with the evidence which has been given in this court, is being tweeted from the very court itself by a person who is making the allegations. I have no hesitation on behalf of my clients in saying he is making unsubstantiated allegations against them as senior ranking police officers.

A tweet of this kind should never be permitted to be sent from a hearing room of a special commission particularly whilst a witness is in the witness box undergoing examination or cross-examination by interested parties. Such a tweet, in my respectful submission, has the capacity not only to interfere with the workings of this Commission but also could constitute a contempt of court.

I choose my words deliberately, Commissioner, in not saying it does constitute a contempt of court, but one is entitled to be of such a strong belief that this is a matter, Commissioner, which should now, in this context, be referred on to the Crown Solicitor's Office, and to the appropriate officer of the Crown Solicitor's Office, for the person responsible for this tweeting to be dealt with, advising the possibility that this person has now committed a contempt of court.

The context in which I make that application is that this appears now not to be the first time there has been such a breach and the similar context being that my clients, the senior police officers, have now had to endure media reporting in a number of media outlets. I have no hesitation in nominating the ABC and the Newcastle Herald as appearing to report matters, or evidence in this matter, which appear to be widely divergent from the evidence which has been presented. Whilst I don't stand here in the capacity of a Commissioner or indeed an inspector of media control, it is somewhat of concern to think that reporting so widely at odds with the evidence in this case is taking place and appears to be continuing to take place.

Commissioner, the application is, firstly, that you exercise your power and control to prevent any such
tweeting occurring from the courtroom itself whilst the Commission is in session; and, secondly, that you give consideration to referring this matter on to the appropriate authority - in this case, the appropriate authority is either the Crown Solicitor's Office itself or, alternatively, the registrar of the Supreme Court - for consideration to be given for Mr Peter Fox to be dealt with for contempt of this Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER; Mr Cohen, may I ask you, firstly, is this Twitter account the account of your client Detective Fox?

MR COHEN: Yes, I'm instructed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Did Mr Fox send this tweet at the time that --

MR COHEN: Yes is the answer to both questions. With that series of fact founded by you, am I able to make some submissions?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: There is a constitutional question which arises here. Do you wish to hear the argument?

THE COMMISSIONER: I trust it won't be long, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: It might be. My friend has raised it. There is --

THE COMMISSIONER: I will hear you, firstly --
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, can I shortcut this because we have many people in court backed up to take evidence. May I make this suggestion: Mr Saidi has outlined very clearly the position of his client. A matter of this importance should be dealt with by written submissions, in my respectful submission, so that court time is not taken up on matters that don't progress the substance of the evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
Mr Cohen, that is true and we have limited time available, but I propose to say this, having, ascertained
that the tweet was sent at the time it was sent.
The tweet is clearly inaccurate in that it says that Detective Inspector Waddell gives evidence that he was closing down Strike Force Georgiana. In fact, his evidence was that it was scaled back after successful investigations and prosecution. And it is misleading because it may be construed by anyone interested in reading it that this is the strike force - that is Georgiana - with which the terms of reference of this Special Commission of Inquiry are concerned, rather than a successful strike force which resulted in the prosecution and conviction of Catholic clergy in the Hunter region not only for child sexual assault but, as we have heard this morning from Detective Inspector Waddel1, for concealing offences as well.

Perhaps it would be better and would result in more accurate tweets if your time in court was spent listening to the evidence than suggesting it improperly. It is indecorous conduct, it is undignified conduct. It is not conduct that should be engaged in by any witness in this inquiry and I hope that this does not happen again.

Perhaps I won't have to raise this again in relation to your first application, Mr Saidi. In relation to the second application, I will consider what might have to be done and written submissions will be appropriate.

MR COHEN: Perhaps you might make directions in that respect.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have Mr Saidi's application.
MR COHEN: We are talking about written submissions, as we need directions for them to be made in chief, in response and then in reply, would you do that please.

MR SAIDI: I have made my submissions. I have made them on my feet. I have requested that the matter be dealt with and that it be referred to the registrar of the Supreme Court for consideration. If there is an opposition to that, perhaps the written submissions could come from my friend.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen, if you wish to make some submissions I will accept them from you. I will not approach the Crown Solicitor's Office or the Supreme

Court in relation to this until I have heard from you either about the submissions or with the submissions.

MR COHEN: By when am I expected to do this?
THE COMMISSIONER: We11, whenever you are disposed to.
I will give you until the end of this week.
MR COHEN: I have to say, with respect, that will not be enough time if they are to be done properly and in writing. I can offer you some oral submissions now, but --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, Mr Cohen, we don't have time for that.

MR COHEN: Then I ask for some time to do this properly, this week. As you must understand, Commissioner, from my perspective it is all consuming. If I am to do written submissions, I would need until next week to do it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. You have till then. Meanwhile I hope it will only be about this one tweet and there won't be any more.

MR COHEN: Well, no, with respect --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, Mr Cohen, please.
MR COHEN: Commissioner, what was raised goes well beyond just my client and it does raise a question of some significance. It has to be dealt with and it is misleading.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, the tweet is inaccurate and misleading.

MR COHEN: We are at cross-purposes, Commissioner. The submissions cannot just be from my client, they have to be from the ABC and the Newcastle Herald, surely as a procedural fairness.

THE COMMISSIONER; I'm not talking about those aspects of Mr Saidi's observations, but --

MS LONERGAN: Can I cut across this debate. As I understand Mr Saidi's position, nothing specific was put in terms of assertions by the ABC and another media outlet.

For that application to be made and put, in my respectful submission, there needs to be some specificity, although I support Mr Saidi's position in raising that matter for the attention of those present and it is appropriate that occur but without more specifics, I didn't see that as Mr Saidi raising that as a specific application.

In the end result, Mr Saidi made a specific two-pronged application - first an application to prevent tweeting while the court was in session; and the second was a specific request that a matter in relation to only one particular individual be referred to the Crown Solicitor's office for consideration. If I am incorrect in that apprehension, I --

MR SAIDI: That's completely correct.
MR COHEN: I misunderstood the reference to the Herald and $A B C$ then.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr Cohen, I think --
MR COHEN: Are we finished now?
THE COMMISSIONER: You're not.
MR COHEN: No, I'm not, on that application --
THE COMMISSIONER: No.
MR KELL: Can I take the opportunity to substitute for exhibit 6, which is the statement of Detective Inspector Waddell, a version that just makes --

THE COMMISSIONER: A further redaction.
MR KELL: If that can be provided to the parties.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR COHEN: Q. Can you tell the Commissioner during your time as crime manager of Lake Macquarie from 2008 until 2011 what the content of your crime investigations policy was concerning child sexual assault?
A. What do you mean what the content of my policy was?
Q. What its content was, what did it say?
A. We didn't have a specific policy in relation to Lake Macquarie. There was a policy, a corporate policy, in relation to sexual assault investigations, which is rather large and I can't recite here.
Q. That was obtained where?

MR KELL: I object to this question and the line of questioning - the contents of the policy of the local area command won't assist the Commission's inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: I agree. Mr Cohen, it's not suggested there was a different policy in Lake Macquarie from any other local area command in New South Wales, is it?

MR COHEN: I was about to ask if there was.
Q. I take it the answer is no?
A. No.
Q. Did it matter if the offender was a Catholic priest?
A. No.
Q. You say in your statement - do you have that there with you in the witness box --
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You say in paragraph 5 of the statement, as I understand it, that you were transferred into Lake Macquarie in 2008 as the crime manager?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was that your first significant command, if I can call
it that?
A. No, that was my second.
Q. What was your first?
A. Waratah Local Area Command.
Q. In what role?
A. Crime manager.
Q. How long were you there?
A. Approximately three years, two and a half, three years.
Q. Strike Force Georgiana was already underway when you
got there?
A. That's correct.
Q. How long had it been on foot, so to speak?
A. I don't know the exact date it kicked off.
Q. Do you have any memory? Was it something that had been ongoing for a while?
A. I can't even tell you the exact date I went to Lake Macquarie. It would have been at least 2007, towards the end of 2007, maybe 2008. I'm speculating. I don't know. I'd have to look at the records.
Q. It may be 12 months?
A. Possibly.
Q. You were briefed by Detective Sergeant Faber about Georgiana when you got there?
A. Yes .
Q. She was the source of information of the facts and circumstances?
A. Yes.
Q. Of what had occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anybody else provide you with information about Georgiana other than her?
A. I spoke to other police officers at the time and obviously there was an e@gl.i investigation.
Q. So we all understand an e@gl.i investigation is a report, is it of --
A. It's a records management system for investigations.
Q. An ongoing updatable system; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You came to understand that Georgiana had five suspects or persons of interest; is that right?

MR KELL: I object.
MR SAIDI: I object.
MR COHEN: Sorry, I thought that's what the evidence was.

MR KELL: Commissioner, it is not clear how you'11 be assisted by this witness being asked questions about the details or otherwise of Strike Force Georgiana. It was limited evidence to the effect of what the landscape was when he was the crime manager in May 2008 insofar as it might have impacted on investigative staffing decisions. That is the end of the relevance of it. To go into the details of another strike force which is not Strike Force Lantle seems to be a matter that won't assist you.

MR COHEN: I don't propose to do that. In fairness to the witness, I intend to lead with two questions to get to the point. Can I have that little latitude. I don't want to canvass it.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, Mr Cohen
MR COHEN: Q. Conceptually, what was the difference between Georgiana and complaints about McAlinden that were the subject of the letters sent to you by AL and Mr Gogarty?

MR KELL: I object to that question on the same grounds, Commissioner. A suggested distinction or comparison is not going to be of assistance.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you just ask the question that you are aiming at, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: Q. Wasn't the situation this, detective inspector, that in the case of the matters that were the subject of complaints in your statement, letters from [AL] and Mr Gogarty, wasn't the material difference between that situation and what was going on in Georgiana that that situation, that is, the complaints that obtained media attention, were a hot political potato because they were obtaining media attention. Isn't that the simple difference between the two sets of facts?
A. No. They were different persons of interest. Georgiana was set up and, as I said, I was briefed when I started at Lake Macquarie on the specific persons of interest that we were looking at, and this was a specific investigation.
Q. Wasn't it possible for you to have an amended term of reference with Georgiana and adding an extra two persons of
interest and take it under the one roof?
MR SAIDI: I object. The term of reference, and I refer to term of reference 1 - relates to Detective Chief Inspector Fox and the circumstances surrounding him being asked to cease investigating in his role - not in terms of Georgiana; Detective Chief Inspector Fox was not in Georgiana and had no involvement in Georgiana. What is the relevance of all of these questions?

THE COMMISSIONER: We have had a plethora of evidence from Detective Inspector Waddell as to why he couldn't take on this area, Mr Cohen. Whether it was called that or expanding something else or called something else, he's explained why he was not disposed to take it on.

MR COHEN: Am I not entitled to test that?
THE COMMISSIONER: Would you test the evidence, please, if you wish.

MR COHEN: Q. Isn't it the case that on 23 Apri1 2010, Ms McCarthy handed documents to Detective Senior Constable McLeod and they are the documents you've given evidence about that?
A. Yes, I've seen a receipt in relation to the receipt of those documents on the 23 rd .
Q. Isn't it the simple fact that McLeod was the reference point because he happened to be involved at the time in Georgiana - not for any other reason, but that he was understood to be involved in Georgiana and a contact point to give these documents. Isn't that so?

MR KELL: I object to that question. I'm not sure this witness is in a position to give evidence as to what might have been in the mind of Detective McLeod at least in terms of the way the question is being put.

MR COHEN: I'm not asking about that. I'm asking about the facts and circumstances these documents came to Lake Macquarie because McLeod was there working in Georgiana.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, Ms McCarthy sent the documents. Perhaps you'11 wait until you have a chance to ask her why she sent them to Detective Senior Constable McLeod.

MR COHEN: Q. You understood from a letter annexed to your statements, annexure A, from [AL], this person was asking you personally: "Please do not ignore my request." You remember that, don't you?
A. Yes, I've seen that document.
Q. You saw it at the time you received it, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understood that proposition at the time you received it?
A. Yes.
Q. You received that letter on 30 April about offences committed on that person by McAlinden, didn't you?
A. Yes .
Q. Was there any response provided by you to that correspondence about it?
A. No, there wasn't.
Q. If you didn't do that, why did you not do it, as a simple courtesy to that person?
A. Because at that stage we weren't progressing the investigation. The investigation had been forwarded to Shaun McLeod via Joan McCarthy. They were both informed that the matter was being transferred to Newcastle for further investigation.
Q. But you had a personal letter from [AL]. What stopped you writing a response to [AL] saying that, rather than through a third party intermediary?
A. I suppose there was nothing that actually stopped me other than the fact that it had been referred on. I hadn't had any contact with that victim other than that letter, and there's plenty of correspondence that comes through that I don't get to reply to.
Q. In matters of equivalent seriousness and concern?
A. I would expect that when the matter was investigated, the investigators assigned would have contact with the victims.
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said.
A. I would expect when the investigation was assigned, the investigators would have contact with the victims.
Q. That's the formal stage when the investigation is started if ever?
A. That's correct.
Q. Prior to that, did it occur to you it was a good idea to communicate with this person who indeed likewise communicate with you about these matters?
A. No.
Q. It doesn't form part of the charter of victims rights?
A. Yes, potentially it could do, yes.
Q. But there just wasn't time to do it; is that right?
A. That's right, there wasn't at that stage.
Q. Do you regret not being able to do it or not doing it at the time?
A. It's probably something I could have done, yes.
Q. You agree, I take it, the allegations made in the [AL] letter and the Gogarty letter, if I can call them that, annexures A and B respectively, to your statement, connote matters of the utmost seriousness, don't they?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. It still didn't strike you at the time, understanding,
as you did, the utmost seriousness of the matter, that it would be a matter of courtesy and respond to these people and say, "Your concerns are not being understood or ignored"?

MR KELL: I object. The witness has been asked a couple of times about this matter --

THE COMMISSIONER: He said he might have, but he didn't.
MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. Is the Commissioner entitled in those circumstances, as at 3 May, to conclude that there was just no real urgency being exhibited about this matter in your command, as crime manager?
A. In which respect?
Q. Well, in any respect?
A. I wouldn't say there was no urgency, but it wasn't a
matter that I would normally attach urgency to.
Q. Even though it was a matter of serious sexual assault allegations and a cover-up of those?
A. With any command at any time, there are numerous serious matters being investigated, some which are of an urgent nature. I wouldn't classify this as having any urgency attached to it. Something of an urgent matter would be a sexual assault that was occurring now, a homicide that was occurring now, a robbery that was occurring now, or very soon prior, maybe overnight. They are urgent matters that require urgent attention and we have many of those on a daily basis; but, no, I wouldn't say this matter was of an urgent type. It was of an important serious complaint but there was no urgency attached to it, that's correct.
Q. There was nothing about it that exhibited to your mind, to your understanding, the justification of the designation that this file should be highly protected? A. No.
Q. Would you ever consider this file to be justified as designated highly protected?
A. Not at that stage, no.
Q. At any stage?
A. No, not in my dealings with - sensitivity, yes, but not highly protected.
Q. You gave evidence earlier today about your discussions about this with Detective Senior Constable McLeod. I don't want to traverse those at great length, but I do wish to put this proposition to you. When you had the discussion with McLeod sometime in mid April 2010 I think is a fair time to fix it - about the 19th rough1y; is that a fair comment?
A. It's in my diary, so $I$ can tell you the exact date. I believe it was 3 May.
Q. Did you say it was as late as 3 May?
A. 3 May, yes.
Q. Thank you for that. When you had that discussion with Detective Senior Constable McLeod, did he not indicate to you that he wished - that is his view - to mount a full investigation and execute search warrants on church
officials such as Archbishop Wilson?
A. I don't recall him specifically saying that, but definitely he wanted to be involved in this investigation. He also wanted to be involved in the Strike Force Lozano investigation, but for the reasons I stated and predominantly they were welfare concerns, I wasn't going to entertain that.
Q. At the same time and in the same conversation, did you not inform him that the matters were too old, McAlinden was dead and nothing about this warranted an investigation?
A. No, that's not correct at all.
Q. Did you not say directly to Detective Senior Constable McLeod, "Shaun, that's not going to happen. The whole thing will go to Newcastle. It is not going to be investigated. I've spoken to region and it's only going to be reviewed"?
A. No.
Q. You said that to him, didn't you?
A. No, I did not. In fact, my document on 3 May, which I sent to Newcastle, was sent there for the purpose of further investigation.
Q. So that document was completed that same day, was it?
A. It was --
Q. What time - I'm sorry; I beg your pardon.
A. My diary entry and the document itself both reflect it was 3 May, yes.
Q. What time of the day was the diary entry?
A. It's in chronological order. I record things in my diary as I go down. I don't have any time.
Q. It's redacted, but in fairness to you and so that the Commissioner understands, if there are entries that disclose apparently a time of day, is that an accurate representation of the time, or is it just that that is a spot you found?
A. If there's a time recorded that's the time the conversation took place.
Q. So you had the discussion on 3 May in the period from 3 to 4 pm ?
A. No.
Q. No? I'm sorry.
A. There's no time recorded next to the conversation I had with Shaun McLeod.
Q. We're at cross-purposes. Go to page 6 of exhibit 7?
A. That's where I am.
Q. The question I put before the one I just had you answer was if you look at the page - I'm sorry, I apologise if you misunderstood my question.
A. I understood the question.
Q. So 3 to 4 pm , is that when it occurred?
A. No, what I said was if there's a time written next to it, that is the time the conversation took place.
I haven't written a time there. It's just - I go down the diary lines as I go.
Q. We're at cross-purposes. Your earlier answer to my question is you don't say that these times are roughly the times of day when these occurred?
A. No, I didn't say that.
Q. I'm sorry, I beg your pardon, I thought you had. So it's just as the diary fills up and as you run out of space you move down the page. Given that there is no attribution of a time there, what time do you say it occurred?
A. I don't know what time it was.
Q. Looking at the page, I can see, for example - this hasn't been redacted but nothing turns on it and there's certainly no secret to it - there is a reference to 8.30 presumably 8.30am on that page?
A. Yes. Obviously I had a conversation with someone at that time in relation to something at 8.30 which I thought was relevant to record the time.
Q. Is that close to the beginning of your working day, or does it vary?
A. 8.30?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I'd normally start - I don't know what time I was starting on that day, but $I$ was starting - when I was at Lake Macquarie, I would start anywhere between 7 and 8 on the day, normally. It could be earlier depending on what
was happening.
Q. There is a reference in the margin below that, it's also not redacted. It looks to me - I'd be grateful if you could confirm - 10.30 or 10 something?
A. It looks like it, yes.
Q. What do you think - 10.30?
A. 10 something.
Q. At least 10 o'clock?
A. Yes.
Q. Having regard to the proximity of the reference to 10 , and this entry about the conversation with Detective Senior Constable McLeod, does that help you with the time of day? A. No. I don't know what time it was. I'd be guessing. It was sometime, by the looks of that entry, between 10.30 and when I left in the afternoon, which could have been any time from 4-3 to 5, 6, depending on what was happening.
Q. You say that you prepared the memorandum that was sent off on 3 May, which is annexure C to your statement?
A. That's correct.
Q. How much time do you ordinarily need to prepare a memorandum?
A. That was only a couple of pages - maybe an hour or two. I'd already reviewed the material.
Q. How long was the discussion with Detective Senior Constable McLeod?
A. I don't know how long.
Q. Doing the best you can, have you got any memory of it?
A. No.
Q. If you've got no memory of it, can you be as certain as you were earlier about what was said to Constable McLeod?
A. Yes, I don't recall how long the conversation went for, though.
Q. You said a moment ago you had no memory of it. Is that just the time or the conversation?
A. I have no memory of how long we spoke for.
Q. Do you have any memory of the conversation?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. I see. So you just disagree with the propositions I put to you?
A. I don't recall how long the conversation went for.
Q. No, no, we are at cross-purposes. You disagree with the propositions I put to you about what Detective Senior Constable McLeod said to you and what you said in reply?
A. Some of them, yes.
Q. Some of them.
A. (Witness nods head).

MR COHEN: I apologise, Commissioner. It's slightly difficult to arrange my papers in this way. Forgive me. If there are a few pauses, it's trying to scan the material. I'm grateful for the assistance from my learned friend Mr Kell.
Q. Paragraph 8 of your statement, do you have it there? A. I do, yes.
Q. In the bundle it is page 438 behind tab 10 , but it is now a part of exhibit 6. Have you got that?
A. Yes, "Annexed to the statement marked with letter C",
is the start of the paragraph.
Q. You tell the Commissioner you wanted the complaint to go to Newcastle; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. You did that, did you not, for two reasons, or more? A. I'm sorry?
Q. You did that for two reasons, or more?
A. The predominant reason was that the area where the Newcastle-Maitland diocese offices were based and that's what the complaint related to.
Q. You said that a couple of times in your evidence, but does that really withstand reasonable scrutiny, detective inspector?
A. Generally that's where the offences are investigated, where they occur.
Q. You say that's the primary reason - a dominant factor, is that a fair way to put it?
A. That's the first factor.
Q. But is it the dominant factor?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it the case in this matter, the subject of the complaints by [AL] and Mr Gogarty, that at the time of the offences, the diocesan office was not in Newcastle but was in Maitland; isn't that right?

MR SAIDI: I object to the question. When reference is made to the offences, I think it should be made clear as to which offences; that is, whether it's the primary offence and what is the concealed offence.

MR COHEN: I'm happy to do that. Both.
Q. Isn't this 1993, detective inspector?

MR KELL: I object, Commissioner. I think the question is probably unfair and it raises legal issues. If there is an alleged concealment that's presumably a continuing offence - if there is a change of geographical location of the persons who are suspected of concealing, then it changes as well and the location of the offence changes.

THE COMMISSIONER: It also raises this witness's knowledge of where the diocese was based at various times in history. He may not know.

MR COHEN: It certainly does, Commissioner. I accept that unreservedly. What I'm trying to indicate is the subtlety of the factors I'm trying to put to the witness is not quite as simple as he would have you understand. I'm trying to test that.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I'm sure Detective Inspector Waddell is capable of telling you his state of knowledge of the locations.

MR COHEN: Let me test it this way.
Q. If I were to say to you that the diocesan office was in Maitland until late 1995, early 1996 - if you assume that - at the time you were doing this review of the facts
and circumstances that occurred in your 3 May letter, that presumably would change your attitude about whether or not it should or should not go to Newcastle, wouldn't it?
A. No, because my understanding is a concealed offence went on for some time and my only consideration was the fact that it occurred or the offices were in Newcastle and that was the appropriate place for it to go to.
Q. You would assume in that line of reasoning that the offence had occurred in multiple locations; is that right? A. Potentially, yes.
Q. And that could mean that you could invoke in investigating that situation the good offices of the unattached detectives in the regional force that were located at Newcastle; is that right?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. It would be possible for you to use those unattached detectives housed at Newcastle but going anywhere inside the region for investigation?
A. There isn't any unattached --
Q. Is that not so? There's not a floating group of detectives who are available to go into any region?
A. No.
Q. You will have in the witness box with you, I hope, a schedule of synonyms that are used to itemise - you should have in the witness box a schedule of initials that provide anonymised two-letter references?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. I'm sorry, Commissioner, I've been given another schedule that's entirely different to what I'm familiar with. Didn't the offences occur to a person identified as [AE] at Raymond Terrace when they occurred?
A. Sorry, what offences?
Q. Number 31 on the list, is that your difficulty? You've got the reference?
A. Yes, I don't know that person.
Q. We'11 do it this way.
A. The offences that we we're looking at with this were the conceal offences, not specific sexual assault offences.
Q. Didn't the Catholic priest - one of the two who are the subject of this inquiry - McAlinden, spend a great bulk of his time in Merriwa in the Hunter Valley?
A. I believe so.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I object, or press the objection again, that the alleged offences relate to concealment. The location or otherwise will --

THE COMMISSIONER: We all know that these two priests are dead and can't be charged in relation to these matters. It is the concealment, isn't it, that is at the centre of this strike force.

MR COHEN: Q. Isn't it the case that the victims are not all found in Newcastle and not all the concealment occurred in Newcastle, the long and the short of it?
A. That's correct.
Q. That being so, there was no essential reason for Newcastle to be taken as the place for the investigation on the arbitrary footing that the diocesan office is now in Newcastle.

## (Pause in proceedings while microphones rearranged for Mr Cohen)

MR COHEN: Q. I'm sorry for the inconvenience to you, detective inspector, but technology is not what it might be sometimes. Not all concealment occurred in Newcastle, did it?
A. Possibly not.
Q. But on these facts and circumstances, as you understood it from the [AL] letter and from the Gogarty letter, it was likely, wasn't it, that that was the case not just possibly not - but that the concealment occurred in many places beyond just Newcastle, isn't it?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: I object to that question. That needs to be specified as to in what respects. It's a global sort of assertion - all concealment may not be in Newcastle and so on. I think it needs to be broken down a bit to be a fair question to the witness.

MR COHEN: Can I explain my position so you can rule on
this, Commissioner.
It's being asserted in his opinion that it was just Newcastle. That seems to be the gravamen of his evidence at least in oral evidence it fell from him this morning led by senior counsel assisting.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's not the evidence. The evidence was that Detective Inspector Waddell considered that the appropriate local area command was Newcastle because that is where the Maitland-Newcastle diocese offices was.

MR COHEN: Q. And the assumption that must overlie it is that is where it occurs and that is what I am putting to you.
A. No, that wasn't my assumption.
Q. If it wasn't your assumption, then you must have been in a position to consider beyond Newcastle and the facts and circumstances beyond Newcastle; is that so?
A. The investigators are attached to individual local area commands. The investigation could only go to one place.
Q. Surely the investigation could have a multi-faceted location?
A. It could, but it would be housed and managed from one local area command. Strike Force Georgiana investigated complaints and matters that didn't just happened with the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command. We had detectives from other area commands working within Lake Macquarie.
Q. Are you saying it was of such complexity and difficulty that it had to go to a central beyond just Newcastle like the State Crime Command?
A. What needed to.
Q. This investigation?
A. No, that's not what I said.
Q. Then why could there not be a multi-faceted approach to this investigation across a number of commands?
A. If it was required, I'm sure that would have been addressed by the Newcastle command.
Q. But didn't these facts suggest themselves very
strongly that that was what was required at the time you were considering it and forming a view?
A. No.
Q. Why was that?
A. Because, as has been stated, the diocesan offices for the Maitland-Newcastle diocese was at Newcastle so that's where I forwarded the complaints on.
Q. So it is just an assumption that's driving your logic now, one that you didn't test in any way; is that right? A. I didn't conduct the investigation. I only looked at the original assessment to see whether it needed to be further investigated and then I sent it - referred it to Newcastle for further investigation to take place. That was the appropriate place I thought for it to be investigated for a number of factors, one being the location.
Q. My question to you which I'd ask you to consider and respond to is: you just made a working assumption about that without having a reasonable foundation for that assumption?

MR SAIDI: I object. There was no assumption made in his evidence and it is wrong to put that to the witness. His evidence is clear that he sent it to Newcastle: (a) because of a resourcing issue; (b) in relation to staffing issues; (c) because Newcastle was the appropriate place, having regard to where these matters occurred. There are no issues of assumption behind that - it is straight fact.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'm with you, Mr Saidi. There weren't any assumptions, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: If the Commission pleases.
THE WITNESS: There is a document attached to my statement.

MR COHEN: Q. You don't need to go on. You sent your memorandum to Chief Inspector Tayler?
A. Yes.
Q. And the long and the short of it was for you petitioning for the file to go to Newcastle?
A. For the matter to be investigated by Newcastle, yes.
Q. But that didn't happen, did it, because it went ultimately, in July that year, to the regional office for review; isn't that right?
A. I believe so. I don't have the information in relation to that specifically.
Q. You are aware, aren't you, that on 12 July Detective Inspector Townsend, the operations manager, produced a report about just where this matter should go?
A. I've been made aware of it, yes, but as far as dates and specifics, I can't give you any detail.
Q. You knew enough that it was about to come back to you for you to write the email that you did to Superintendent Rae, copied to Townsend, didn't you?
A. Yes. I wrote that email after making inquiries with the region office, as I gave in my evidence, and those inquiries by myself were made because of a phone call from the Newcastle area.
Q. In the addendum to that memorandum which is annexure D to your statement at page 447 of the bundle - I'm sorry I don't know which number it is in your statement by number, but if you have it, annexure D; do you have that?
A. Yes.
Q. Didn't Inspector Townsend say - you record the view that the original decision to send it to Lake Macquarie was sound?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. So he took a contradictory view to you, didn't he?
A. He didn't have possession probably of some of the information in relation to our command.
Q. So are you saying his decision was unsound, are you?
A. No, I'm not saying that at all.
Q. He just took a different view to you, didn't he?
A. That's right.
Q. What changed his mind wasn't the compelling force of the logic but the internal complaint that you made, isn't that right?

MR KELL: I object to that. This witness is not able to
give evidence as to what did or didn't alter Inspector Townsend's mind.

THE COMMISSIONER: That has to be right, Mr Cohen. Could you ask your next question, please.

MR COHEN: Excuse me, Commissioner, I'm just checking my working notes for the day. I don't have a transcript, so this process is a little bit slower, I apologise.
Q. This morning you indicated that the overal 1 management role needed a helicopter view and then you went on to give some evidence about the circumstances of the involvement of the crime manager in resourcing. Can I put it to you that if not the most important resource for the crime manager, is the years of experience of his or her detectives in investigating matters day in, day out; is that a fair question for you to answer?
A. I'd say the most important resources are the people, yes.
Q. And those people are important not just because they are good people but because they have lots of experience of investigating criminal events and solving them; is that right?
A. Yes. That's true to some extent, yes.
Q. Would you prefer a detective of whatever rank who had 35 years of experience over somebody who had much less? A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, it's like barristers, isn't it. Some might be good after just a few years and some might be terrible after 35 years?

MR COHEN: Yes, indeed. I tell myself that all the time. I take your point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. You were taken to the bundle of documents that accompanied the material provided to you under an email from Detective Senior Constable McLeod --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes.
Q. You went through that bundle and while you weren't completely sure, you weren't in too much doubt that that was the material, would that be fair?
A. I believe that to be so, yes.
Q. Your evidence was that you believed the documents were them. Assuming they are the documents you accept, one, these are evidence of serious crime?
A. Yes.
Q. And, two, did that lead to you recording these materials and the events and facts and circumstances at a so-called COPS event or a COPS case or none of those? A. No, no, the documents were forwarded along with my memorandum to Newcastle, so that was the documentation of the matter at that stage.
Q. This is the 3 May letter; is that it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that letter become such a COPS event or a COPS case or anything systemically?
A. No, I didn't create one, no.
Q. Why didn't you do that?
A. I don't normally create COPS events. It's normally the investigators that will commit to the system.
Q. Isn't there some risk if you don't do that as a point of carriage in the sense of a chain of custody, if I can use that term, perhaps slightly inaccurately? Assume you need to be able to show from point to point to point where things are, where they have been, who had them, who has got them, is there not some need with bundles of material like this to record them systemically so that someone can say, "Hey, where that has got to", if they have to?
A. There are systems that do that, yes.
Q. How would you do that?
A. That would normally go on the TRIM system.
Q. The TRIM system. And you did not do that with this bundle and this matter?
A. I'm not sure if it was placed on TRIM or not. Often times things from Charlestown didn't get TRIME-ed because we didn't always have people who operated the TRIM system
there. Sometimes we forwarded them on without them being TRIM-ed, that's correct.
Q. Do you think that's the case with these documents?
A. I don't know. I would have to look at the original documents.
Q. Is there a risk management problem that you see arising there?

MR KELL: I object.
MR SAIDI: I object to the general line of questioning, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it's not necessary, thank you, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. Detective inspector, can I put a direct question to you. You didn't seem to have much appetite for taking this file as at May 2010. I don't think I'm overstating that position, am I? You weren't really interested in taking it and running with it?
A. Investigating it at Lake Macquarie?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. You didn't share the passion or the interest or the commitment of Detective Senior Constable McLeod?

THE COMMISSIONER: I reject the question about "passion", Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I beg your pardon.
Q. You didn't share the same view as Detective Senior Constable McLeod in the way he expressed it to you?
A. In that Detective Senior Constable McLeod wanted to investigate it?
Q. Yes.
A. He did want to investigate it. I've said that before.
Q. I am sorry, I missed that.
A. I have said before he did want to be involved in the investigation, as he wanted to be involved in other
investigations.
Q. You didn't share his view?
A. Of him being involved in it? No.
Q. No, it being worthy of investigation by Lake Macquarie?
A. Not that it wasn't worthy, just that for the facts and reasons I've already given I believe that, one, we weren't in a position to give it appropriate attention at the time and I believe it was more appropriate that it be investigated by Newcastle.
Q. You understood at the time, did you not, that Newcastle were having their own problems similar to the type you characterised at Lake Macquarie?
A. They may have.
Q. You were aware of that, weren't you, from your daily discussions with Detective Chief Inspector Tayler?
A. No.

MR SAIDI: I object. What this witness believed or may or may not have believed is not relevant. It's a region command decision, not his.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't allow this, Mr Cohen. This witness wouldn't have the knowledge of what was going on in Newcastle to that extent, surely.

MR COHEN: I was testing it. It's a matter for you.
THE COMMISSIONER: He's given some evidence about the respective resources in the locations and the reason why his local area command couldn't do justice to an investigation of that scope at the time. Is there anything more on that?

MR COHEN: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Q. Can I ask you to look, and probably your statement is the most sensible place - if you start at page 441. Is it some time since you've had a chance to read those documents, or are you reasonably au fait with their contents, that is to say, annexure A and annexure B? Do
you want to reread them to be sure?
A. Do you want me to reread them?
Q. I am asking you in fairness: are you sufficiently across their contents to be able to answer questions about them?
A. No, I would probably have to read them again.
Q. Please. I'm sorry Commissioner, but that's the only way to deal with it.
A. Yes.
Q. In your memorandum of 3 May - this is at page 2 of that memorandum which is annexure C - in the second paragraph from the top of page 2 commencing, "The current bishop", you go on to identify everything that, in your view, the current bishop has done, and this is as at May 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. But there's no identification of former events. Is there any reason for that, that is, before the current bishop was appointed?
A. Because I didn't have any dealings with those prior events. My involvement purely was in relation to the current events.
Q. Did you take steps to acquaint yourself with those prior events before you came to this view - your view - the current position was "reasonable"?
A. No.
Q. Should you have done it?
A. I don't think so. It was an assessment of whether there was sufficient evidence there to warrant
investigation and I forwarded that to Newcastle. The consideration in that second paragraph of the second page of my document is in relation to dealings that we had with Bishop Malone to make the investigators aware so that, when they investigated the matter, they knew how to - they may be able to address that aspect of the investigation.
Q. But what aspect? How can it be relevant what he did or did not do in 2010 having regard to the fact that you were charged, on the face of the allegations by [AL] and by Mr Gogarty, about these prior events when he wasn't the bishop? How does it matter what Bishop Malone thought
about those events that were being considered? A. It may impact - it may be very useful for investigators.
Q. I'm sorry, detective inspector, isn't that just a non sequitur. How could it matter to them what the current bishop thought?
A. How they went about the investigation, how they approached people, their attitude, it may be very relevant.
Q. Couldn't that be read as a heads up to other investigators, this is a real political hot potato, tread carefully because the church might be really worried about what you do?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I thought you disallowed a question along those lines earlier today.

MR COHEN: I don't recall that but?
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, among other things, Chief Inspector Waddell passes on the fact that Bishop Malone has made a public comment that he could have handled matters of sexual assault better.

MR COHEN: I accept that.
THE COMMISSIONER: That may be a very relevant area for investigators to commence with the bishop.

MR COHEN: It's a question of concealment, I don't understand.

THE COMMISSIONER: That could be an area of investigation for them to pursue.

MR COHEN: Very well.
THE COMMISSIONER: To find out from what the bishop what he meant, what could have been handled better, who didn't do it right, what he thought should have happened.

MR COHEN: Let me explore that.
Q. You heard what the Commissioner said but this is just relying on public comments by the bishop. You didn't go and have a personal chat with him over a cup of tea, did
you?
A. Well, I have --
Q. At this time in May 2010?
A. I can't remember exactly when it was but certainly I had a chat with him with Detective Sergeant Faber.
Q. When do you think it was that you had that?
A. I can't remember. I'd have to go back to my diaries and have a look.
Q. Doing the best you can, have you got any memory of it?
A. No, no.
Q. Is it likely to have been May 2010?
A. No, I don't believe it was in May. I don't know when it was.
Q. Do you think it was after this time, or before it?
A. I don't know. I'd have to go back to the records and have a look, but I had spoken with him, yes.
Q. I'm sorry, I missed that.
A. I'd have to go back to the records to check, but I have spoken to him, yes.
Q. What did he say to you that was relevant to concealing serious --
A. Nothing. It wasn't that - we weren't discussing specific issues in relation to the investigation.
Q. Did you make a note of it?
A. Yes. It would be recorded in the diary.
Q. Whenever that was?
A. Correct.
Q. You would have to go and look for it?
A. Yes.

MR COHEN: If the Commission pleases.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. You referred in your evidence, going back to your diary, that you had two telephone calls in August, one with Ms McCarthy and one with Detective Chief Inspector

Fox. Do you recall giving that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Those conversations, according to your diary, occurred just under two weeks of each other?
A. Yes.
Q. At the time did Peter Fox, to your knowledge, have any involvement whatsoever in any investigation relating to the Catholic Church?

MR COHEN: I object. This doesn't arise.
MR SAIDI: It doesn't have to arise. I'm cross-examining.
THE COMMISSIONER: I'11 allow it.
THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.
MR SAIDI: Q. In terms of the apparent reasons for the cal1 made by Detective Chief Inspector Fox to you, was there any apparent reason as to why such a call was to be made or was made to you?
A. I don't recall anything other than the record in my diary, which was in relation to this matter and whether it had been forwarded back to us for investigation - whether there was any other reason for the call, I don't recall.
Q. From your knowledge of the matters that were the subject of discussion, was there any reason that you could ascertain from either what he told you or from what you knew from elsewhere as to why he should be calling you about the matter?
A. Only the fact that it had come to us originally and obviously there was some sort of report out there that had come back to us for further investigation.
Q. But in terms of his involving himself in the matter, was there any apparent reason that you knew of as to why he should be involving himself?
A. No.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR McILWAINE:

MR McILWAINE: Q. At any time during your involvement
with the matters we've been discussing today, did any senior officer of police approach you to do some favours for the Catholic Church in this matter?
A. No.
Q. And you conducted your limited role in this matter in the normal way in accordance with your duties; is that correct?
A. Yes, I did.

MR McILWAINE: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr McIlwaine. Mr Kell?
MR KELL: I have no questions in re-examination. Could Detective Inspector Waddell be excused.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your evidence, Detective Inspector Waddel1. You are excused.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MS LONERGAN: Mr Hunt has asked whether we could have a five-minute adjournment so we can stretch our legs before we start the next witness, who I hope will be able to be completed in a short time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'11 grant that adjournment to Mr Hunt.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I call inspector David Michae1 Matthews.
<DAVID MICHAEL MATTHEWS, sworn: [3.30pm]
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MS LONERGAN: Q. Your full name is David Michael Matthews?
A. That's correct.
Q. You are an inspector of police currently at Port Stephens Local Area Command?
A. Correct.
Q. You've been an inspector at Port Stephens Local Area

Command since 2008?
A. I have.
Q. And in November 2010 you had a period of acting commander at Port Stephens Local Area Command?
A. That's correct.

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, could it be noted this witness also wishes section 23 to apply to him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi, that is noted.
MS LONERGAN: Q. And you prepared a statement with the assistance of your lawyers dated 1 May 2013. I'11 just show you a copy of it and I have a copy for the Commissioner. Is that statement true and correct?
A. It is.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that statement, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Inspector Matthews will be admitted and marked exhibit 8.

EXHIBIT \#8 STATEMENT OF INSPECTOR DAVID MATTHEWS
MS LONERGAN: Q. Prior to November 2010, inspector, had you had any period as acting commander at the Port Stephens Local Area Command, or is that the only one?
A. I think it was the only period of relieving that I've had. Without checking my personal records I couldn't tell you accurately.
Q. Having worked at the Port Stephens Local Area Command in the role of inspector, did you have a reasonable idea of the resources available to it?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. That included the resources available to it as at November 2010 specifically?
A. Yes.
Q. In November 2010, in paragraph 7, you refer to this matter, you were provided with a document by Detective Chief Inspector Peter Fox?
A. That's correct.
Q. Prior to being provided with that document, have you
had any discussions with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about the matters raised in that document?
A. No, I hadn't.
Q. So the document came to you with no particular warning or prior discussion?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you know whether Detective Chief Inspector Fox was carrying out any investigations into alleged concealing of child sexual assault offences on the part of Catholic priests?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Did you read the document yourself?
A. I did.
Q. Was it presented to you by Detective Chief Inspector Fox with any particular oral information, or was it just left on your desk or what happened?
A. He handed it to me personally. I was seated in the commander's office and he walked in and handed it to me.
Q. With no discussion of what was in it?
A. He just asked me to read it and then consider its contents.
Q. You note in paragraph 7 that you have annotated on the last page of the document, which is page 329 down the bottom of the copy annexed to your statement, the following:

> The recommendations of Detective Chief Inspector Fox are supported. Given the nature of these allegations, these matters appear beyond the scope of a [local area investigation] and could be more appropriately dealt with by a taskforce. Referred to region.

I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about what you are referring to there. First of all, given the nature of these allegations, what did you mean by that in the context of your comment?
A. It appeared to be a complex investigation and historical investigation, which, in my opinion, would have taken a bit of work on the part of investigators. We just
didn't have the investigators or the assets available to the Port Stephens Local Area Command at that time to do that investigation.
Q. So beyond the scope of a local area command investigation, was that part of that consideration in relation to the matters you've just raised?
A. Specifically applicable to the Port Stephens Local Area Command. We were stretched and we already had a couple of investigations running which were quite complex. We could not take on another investigation.
Q. When you say "referred to region", what was the expected process as to what would happen at region in relation to the referral?
A. I would expect that it would go through to the region operations manager for consideration, but he is aware of what is occurring across the adjoining LACs, and the region, in relation to operations and task forces and he would be in a good position to determine where to send it to.
Q. Do you recall having any particular discussions with the operations manager of Northern Region, who was at the time Inspector Townsend, about this particular report?
A. I didn't discuss the report with Inspector Townsend. It was TRIM-ed and it was forwarded on to region.
Q. That's the usual procedure in relation to these sorts of matters being raised for consideration of allocation of resources to investigate?
A. Absolutely.
Q. In paragraph 10 of your statement, you mention that you advised Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you recommended the matter be referred to region because that was your belief that was the more appropriate course of action. Was there an alternative course that you could have adopted in relation to managing that particular report?
A. As in - sorry, could you rephrase the question?
Q. In paragraph 10 of your statement, you say that you advised Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you had referred the matter to region, and that's the way you approached your report that was provided to you, and you say that that was because that was a more appropriate course of action.

Was there an alternative course of action you could have adopted in relation to the report, or was that not realistic - there was no realistic alternative?
A. There was no realistic alternative. We could not conduct that investigation.
Q. In paragraph 11 you make particular observations regarding why you made the recommendation in the terms there, and one of those matters is that, to your mind, at least, the local area command at Port Stephens was severely stretched in terms of resources available to it and you've outlined that was your belief as to the position. Did you tell Detective Chief Inspector Fox that that was your position as to why it would not be appropriate for the matter to be dealt with at Port Stephens?
A. I did. We had a discussion.
Q. To your recollection, did Detective Chief Inspector Fox say anything in reply to you about that particular issue of resources?
A. I don't recall what his response was, but I do know that we did have a conversation about it.
Q. The two separate strike forces you refer to in paragraph 11 that were running at the local area command at the time, may I ask, were they related to church paedophilia or unconnected?
A. Unconnected.
Q. In paragraph 12 you mention that after you signed off on the report, you recall discussing the matter with the Superintendent Charles Haggett, who you had filled in for while he was away. Do you recall any particular discussions with Superintendent Haggett about the content of the report?
A. Yes, we had a discussion, and I believe it occurred when we did our handover, after he returned on the Monday, and he advised me that, prior to going on leave, he'd already discussed these matters with Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
Q. Did you show Superintendent Haggett a copy of the report of 25 November 2010?
A. I don't believe I kept a copy. I believe I just forwarded the original --
Q. Was that the usual procedure in relation to referring
matters up the line in that fashion?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Did you make any particular notes of any discussion you had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox regarding the 25 November report?
A. I didn't.
Q. Did you make any notes of any discussion you had with Superintendent Haggett about that report?
A. I didn't.
Q. Is that the normal course in relation to your acting role, that you wouldn't necessarily notate those particular matters as they had been formalised in another fashion? A. That's correct, and I did a formal handover with Commander Haggett and it was written. I don't have a copy of the written handover, which is my normal practice.
Q. Inspector, do you know a former police officer Quinn, first name Justin?
A. I do know former Detective Senior Sergeant Justin Quinn
Q. What were the circumstances in which you knew Justin Quinn?
A. Justin Quinn was the head of prosecuting when I was a duty officer at Newcastle police station prior to me moving to Port Stephens.
Q. Did you have any particular knowledge of Justin Quinn's background in terms of his investigation experience?
A. I did. When Justin first came to the LAC, or it may have been when I first went to the LAC, I'm not sure which way it was --
Q. This is Port Stephens LAC?
A. Newcastle, yes. We had a conversation and, as I do, I asked him what his background was and he told me that his background was in I believe it was child sexual assault and that he was from - came from northern New South Wales, as in an LAC in northern New South Wales somewhere. I don't recall which one.
Q. Did he outline for you how many years he had been working on child sexual assault type matters?
A. No. It was a general conversation.
Q. Did you at any stage tell Detective Chief Inspector Fox that Justin Quinn had never been a detective or an investigator?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Would a statement to that effect be consistent with what you knew about Justin Quinn as at 2010?
A. That is correct.
Q. It is consistent or inconsistent?
A. Sorry, it would be inconsistent for me to say that he had no investigative background.
Q. Are you aware that Detective Chief Inspector Fox has given evidence to this inquiry that he asked you for information about Justin Quinn and that he was told that he has never been a detective or an investigator by you? A. I am aware of that.
Q. And is that a fair reflection of what you told Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. It is not.
Q. Did you have any discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you recall where you offered an opinion or knowledge as to Justin Quinn's background in investigation?
A. I did, and it occurred not in 2010; it occurred in 2012, on 22 February 2012.
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order from Page 612 line 33 to Page 613 1ine 2]
Q. Can I interrupt you there. It's important we don't stray outside matters that are directly relevant to our terms of reference or at least closely enough matters of concern that we ought to go into them. I first want to direct your mind to any conversation you personally had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, not so much the circumstances around it, but the fact that you had a discussion with him. Was it on that date?
A. It was on that day.
Q. Are you able to pinpoint that date, because, on that date, certain matters were raised with you by a particular officer under your command?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can we move to the discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. It occurred in the conference room at Raymond Terrace police station. It was after the training day. The training day had adjourned. He approached me and --
Q. "He" being Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes. As I was leaving the training day, Detective Chief Inspector Fox was standing in the middle of the training room.
Q. What did he say to you?
A. He called me over and asked me when I was at Newcastle had I worked with Justin Quinn and Kirren Steel. I told him that I had. I don't recall the rest of the conversation, but $I$ do recall him asking me what their role was or their roles were when I was at Newcastle. I told him that Justin Quinn was a prosecutor and that Kirren was a sergeant. I said to him, "You'd better not print that in your book", and then I turned and walked out of the room. I walked through to the duty officer's office and I reported that conversation to Inspector Meares.
Q. Was there a question within that conversation you've just outlined that asked you to outline the background experience of Justin Quinn prior to you having interface with him at Newcastle when he was a prosecutor? A. No. Basically the question was what were their roles when I was at Newcastle with them.
Q. Why did you report that particular exchange to the duty officer?
A. Because of what had happened earlier in the day with the other police officer, I felt that --
Q. Without going into any more details about what happened with the other officer, if you could just outline your response to those circumstances?
A. I guess it was a bit of a vent really to another duty officer about the behaviour of Chief Inspector Fox.

MS LONERGAN: Those are my questions, Commissioner.
MR RUSH: I may have just one question. I am waiting on some instructions.

MR McILWAINE: I have one question and I'd like to ask it in a fairly roundabout way because it's about that police officer about which he's spoken.
<EXAMINATION BY MR McILWAINE:
MR McILWAINE: Q. Do you have a list of code names in front of you?
A. No, I don't.

MR McILWAINE: Perhaps the witness could be shown that.
THE COMMISSIONER: It is the blue and white document.
MR McILWAINE: Q. Firstly, was the officer that you spoke, to your understanding, related to one of the persons on that list, without giving that person's initial?
A. No.

MR RUSH: I have no question either.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Thank you. Can I have just one moment.
<EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:
MR COHEN: [Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from Page 614 line 45 to page 615, line 34]

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I have to agree. I do make that non-publication order about any conversation in relation to another police officer and any family connections with anything that has been mentioned. That order is made under section 8 of the Special Commissions Inquiry Act 1983.

MR COHEN: Can I add this, Commissioner. Very serious allegations have been made against - I'll ask this question.
Q. None of this appears in your statement, does it?

MS LONERGAN: I object. I withdraw my objection.
MR SAIDI: I'm going to maintain my objection. What relevance is it as to whether or not it's in the statement or not? It's the material that is being referred to that is being objected to as being irrelevant.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Cohen, I --
MR COHEN: I'11 approach it this way.
Q. Isn't it the case the matter that you talked about putting aside all particulars and any identities - was nothing more than an official file that had been sent to DCI Fox and the author requested departmental approval to speak to him? That's all that happened, isn't it?

MS LONERGAN: I object. Again it's more examination of the irrelevant matter that was stumbled upon accidentally by a question I asked where part of the answer was, in effect, not entirely responsive and gave details not required by this Commission.

MR COHEN: It might have been stumbled upon, but it's made in these circumstances where was raised by others. This is a matter that is of the utmost gravity with regard to the alleged conduct of Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Surely it must be able to be examined in that way, otherwise the matter should just entirely be struck out.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, isn't the important conversation the conversation about Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn and his qualifications or --

MR COHEN: I accept that unreservedly, Commissioner, but the genie is out of the bottle about the other matter. You'11 be invited to form adverse views about my client and his conduct in circumstances that are just almost impossible to deal with.

THE COMMISSIONER: I won't be making any adverse finding about anything in relation to that conversation whatsoever.

MR COHEN: If that's clear.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I'm indebted to you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: What about the next part of the day?
MR COHEN: Q. Detective inspector, the conversation between you and Detective Chief Inspector Fox about Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn and Detective Sergeant Steel was limited to - DCI Fox was asking you what you knew about each of them and you responding, as you've indicated, but with no reference to any book. That's right, isn't it? A. No, that's not correct.
Q. And that comment about "Don't put it in the book" is just a gratuitous aside that didn't occur, isn't it?
A. That's not correct.
Q. That testimony of yours was simply a method by which you are trying to blacken the reputation of Chief Inspector Fox, isn't it?
A. Absolutely not.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. If I can come back to the issue of the book, did you have any conversations with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about writing a book and, if so, when were they?
A. I can't give you specific dates of the conversation, but we did have conversations about Detective Chief Inspector Fox writing a book and I think it arose initially as a bit of a cathartic measure when he was on sick report, because he did suffer some severe --
Q. Did he tell you what the book was about in that conversation; if so, what was it?

MR COHEN: I object. What does it matter?
MR SAIDI: It does because it was put to this witness that there was no such conversation about a book.

MR COHEN: He denied that. Why does that need justification or clarification?

MR SAIDI: Because it goes to a very serious issue,
relating to, firstly, what was put through instructions and what the situation was. The reference to a book comes out from other sources in this inquiry not merely from this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'11 allow it.
THE WITNESS: Could you repeat your question?
MR SAIDI: Q. When we come to your discussions with him about a book, did he tell you what the book was about; if so, what did he tell you?
A. He said it was going to be about his career as a detective of some 30 years and I do believe that he said the 30 or so murders that he had investigated.
Q. And the discussions about a book being written by him, over what period of time did they occur, can you tell us? A. Those discussions would have occurred over a couple of years.
Q. From when to when?
A. Certainly for two years prior to Detective Chief Inspector Fox going on extended sick leave in June 2012.
Q. I want to come back to a topic relating to the extent of resourcing or lack of resourcing that Port Stephens had to conduct an investigation at that time. Let me approach it this way: how many cases were there being handled by Port Stephens Local Area Command in 2010, round about August or thereabouts?
A. A ballpark figure, and that's what it is, would be 250 to 300 cases.
Q. And how many task forces or strike forces were running out of Port Stephens at the one time?
A. We had one strike force - Strike Force Varberg investigating a murder and we had Operation Seamist investigating ongoing drug supply.
Q. In what phase was Operation Seamist at that time?
A. It was about to move to execution or arrest phase.
Q. In terms of Operation Seamist, how many detectives were assigned to that operation?
A. One of the detective sergeants, Detective Sergeant Wheatley, he was assisted by officers from the proactive
team and a restricted duties officer from Stroud and one of our uniformed officers from general duties, who is now working in the detectives office.
Q. The other strike force, how many detectives were allocated to that?
A. Two detectives were allocated to that and they were assisted by our State Crime Command homicide unit because we couldn't staff it.
Q. Assuming Port Stephens were to take over the investigation relating to the Catholic paedophile matters, how many detectives would be available to undertake such an investigation under the lead, if we assume that to be the case, of Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. I had one detective sergeant and three detective constables available, as I had another detective constable on long-term sick report with a specific injury.
Q. In terms of resources, was Port Stephens in a position whereby those detectives could be released in order to assist with another investigation?
A. Detective Sergeant Metcalfe was deeply involved in a ram-raid investigation involving about $\$ 2$ million worth of ram raids and he could not be released from those duties, which left three detectives and they were required for the day-to-day issues arising in the LAC.
Q. In further terms of resourcing, in terms of physical space or room at Raymond Terrace, what can you tell us about that?
A. Varberg and Seamist were located off site. At that point in time we were in temporary accommodation, being the YMCA at Raymond Terrace. Mr Gralton, who was the local commander at Central Hunter, had graciously allowed us to use Beresfield police station to stage our operation and strike force.
Q. Does one take it from that last answer there was no room whereby detectives could be housed, if they were specifically allocated to a new or fresh investigation? A. Absolutely no room, and no additional computers there.
Q. Computer equipment and assets of that kind, was there any such equipment available to house a fresh strike force or task force?
A. No.
Q. What about in terms of other assets or resources, were they available to house a fresh strike force or task force? A. We were in the throes at that point of time of sending submissions through to region, seeking additional staff and additional vehicles for the LAC, and additional computers.
Q. In terms of Operation Seamist, which had been ongoing, did Detective Chief Inspector Fox play a direct role in that?
A. No, he didn't.
Q. In terms of any directions or instructions given to him relating to media involvement, to your knowledge, were any instructions given in relation to that aspect?
A. I'm not aware of any instructions.
Q. You were aware, as I understand it, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox attended a meeting in December of 2010 in relation to the investigation of Roman Catholic paedophilia matters?
A. I'm aware of that meeting, yes.
Q. Were you aware of that from speaking to him or other sources?
A. I can't recall if I spoke to Detective Chief Inspector Fox or someone else, but I was aware that he had attended a meeting.
Q. After he attended the meeting, what discussions, if any, did you have with him about the meeting?
A. I do believe that he told me that he had been instructed to hand over any documents that he had and cease investigating, if he was.
Q. Were there any other discussions at that time?
A. I don't recall any other discussion.
Q. Do you have any knowledge one way or the other as to whether or not Detective Chief Inspector Fox was undertaking any investigation in relation to Roman Catholic paedophilia-related matters?
A. I have no knowledge of Detective Chief Inspector Fox undertaking an investigation of that kind.
Q. When you say you have no knowledge, does that mean to the best of your knowledge he wasn't, or does that mean
something else?
MR COHEN: I object. It means what it says. He had no knowledge.

MR SAIDI: He had no knowledge. It could be ambiguous. It could be interpreted he had no knowledge one way or the other, or it could be interpreted that if I knew --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it could be both ways. Mr Cohen. Please ask the question again, Mr Saidi.

MR SAIDI: Q. In terms of Detective Chief Inspector Fox conducting any Roman Catholic paedophilia-related matters or sexual abuse matters, do you have any knowledge one way or the other, firstly, as to whether or not he was conducting such investigations?
A. I have no knowledge one way or the other as to whether or not he was conducting investigations.
Q. At any time during the course of 2010 are you able to tell us whether or not Detective Chief Inspector Fox ever raised with you the subject matter of his conducting such an investigation?
A. No, he didn't. The first I knew of the matters that Detective Chief Inspector Fox raised was when I received the report, which is attached to my statement.
Q. You became aware or, rather, that was the first time it was raised with you. In your position at Port Stephens at that time, do you have a view or an opinion one way or the other whether or not the conducting of an investigation by Detective Chief Inspector Fox without the knowledge of his superior officers was appropriate or not?

MR COHEN: I object. The report, which is annotated by this witness, speaks for itself.

MR SAIDI: I'm asking whether or not this officer believed it would be appropriate or not if such an investigation was being carried out. There's no such report by this officer, or no such report. All we've got is, with respect, what is contained in his statement, and no more.

THE COMMISSIONER: The question can be asked, Mr Cohen.
THE WITNESS: May I just clarify what date?

MR SAIDI: Q. In 2010, during the period July to December.
A. The question was?
Q. Assume that he was conducting an investigation in relation to paedophilia-related matters, whether it be with the Catholic Church or otherwise, and such investigation was not brought to the attention of his superiors, do you have a view one way or the other whether that would be appropriate?

MR COHEN: I object. I maintain my objection. It's hypothetical.

MR SAIDI: It's been ruled upon. I ask the witness to answer it.

THE WITNESS: In my opinion it would be inappropriate because there would be no oversighting mechanisms in relation to the investigation.

MR SAIDI: Q. I want to ask you about police procedure if I may. In terms of a commander or a person holding the rank of a superior officer to another person or to another serving officer, what can you tell us about an officer going into the office of another officer in order to obtain a file or documentation?
A. I see absolutely nothing wrong with that.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Because I've done it myself, and if I need a file for any particular reason $I$ will go looking for the file if the officer is not available and can't give me the file. I've done it before and I see no problem with it, especially if the commander of the LAC is one of those officers.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.
MS LONERGAN: No re-examination, Commissioner. Might the inspector be excused.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are excused.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MR HUNT: I call Brad Tayler.
<BRAD TAYLER, sworn:
MR McILWAINE: Before my friend commences, I am instructed that my client wishes to give his evidence unwillingly in court.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr McIlwaine. I understand that position, thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR HUNT:

MR HUNT: Q. Is your name Brad Tayler?
A. That's correct.
Q. Were you formerly a detective chief inspector of police attached to Newcastle Sydney local area command?
A. Yes.
Q. I'11 just show the witness a further amended statement and one for you, Commissioner. Mr Tayler, is that a statement that you signed on 6 May 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. Subject to the redactions either to respect the anonymity of various people or relevance, is the statement true and correct?
A. Yes, it is.

MR HUNT: I tender the statement.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Mr Brad Tayler of 6 May 2013 will be admitted and marked exhibit 9.

EXHIBIT \#9 STATEMENT OF MR BRAD TAYLER OF 6/5/2013.
MR HUNT: Q. Were you attested into the New South Wales police force in October 1984?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you commence by performing general duties at Hornsby and then Newcastle before transferring to traffic duties?
A. Yes.
Q. In 1989 did you commence detectives training?
A. Yeah, commenced what they call A list duties, that's correct.
Q. In that event, were you transferred to Kings Cross detectives and to the drug unit in 1994?
A. Went to the Kings Cross detectives office, followed by a stint at what was the drug enforcement agency in 1997 I think it was. I was also in the drug unit at Kings Cross as well.
Q. That is what $I$ was trying to get to, that you were a detective at the drug unit in Kings Cross. In 1997 you have referred to being transferred to what was then known as the drug enforcement agency in Sydney?
A. Yes.
Q. You were promoted to the rank of detective sergeant in 1997 at Tamworth.
A. Yes.
Q. In the year 2000, you were promoted to inspector level 3 at Tamworth?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2002, you were promoted to inspector leve1 2 at Waratah?
A. Yes.
Q. And a mild correction to paragraph 3 of your statement - rather than 2004, it was 2003 that you were promoted to be detective chief inspector at Lake Macquarie command.
A. Yes .
Q. You held the position of crime manager there?
A. Yes.
Q. And in 2008 you were transferred by the then Northern Region commander to Newcastle City Local Area Command as the crime manager.
A. Yes.
Q. At the time you were transferred to Newcastle City as the crime manager, Superintendent Max Mitchell was the commander of that command?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were transferred at the time that that new command was created, because of the amalgamation of two
pre-existing local area commands; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Is it the position that you remained as the crime manager at Newcastle City Local Area Command until you commenced extended sick leave in December 2010?
A. Yes .
Q. Can you pick up what your last day was before you started that?
A. It was either 20 or 22 December, I think it was.
Q. Ultimately, you were medically discharged from the New South Wales Police Service in December 2011?
A. Around about then, yes.
Q. Later on I'm going to circle back and ask you some more questions about the circumstances of those events that led you to going on extended leave. At the time you provided your statement you had been provided some limited materials by the Crown Solicitor's Office at the same time as you got a request in writing for a statement; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. The materials that you had were photocopies of your own diaries from 2009 and 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it turn out, when you looked at your 2009 diaries, that there was some material that looked like it might have been of potential relevance, but ultimately proved to be in relation to investigations in relation to an entirely different denomination and different religious church and other activities in relation to that?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. In short, is that the reason for the redaction of paragraphs 8 to 12 on the second page of your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you also provided an investigator's note of 3 December 2010 that was entitled "Case conference in relation to Strike Force Lantle"?
A. Yes.
Q. Thinking about that now, was that an investigator's
note that was written by then Detective Sergeant Justin Quinn?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you also shown or provided with an email that you were copied into dated 18 September 2010 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Have I this morning, in the company of your solicitor, Mr McIlwaine, taken you to various emails and other materials that you haven't read for some time since the original correspondence?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Would you just outline, in brief, your evidence about the role of crime manager, as you saw it, both when you originally were at Lake Macquarie and then your attachment at Newcastle City Local Area Command?
A. My comments are very similar to what Dave Waddell said earlier. My role, amongst other things, was in charge of criminal investigations within the Newcastle City command, which comprised a detectives office, a drug unit office, a proactive unit office. I was also responsible for a number of areas including intelligence and so forth. At one stage I was responsible for the licensing unit. There was heaps of stuff that I was responsible for, but it was basically the oversight of crime and major incidents in the command and anything the commander wanted me to look at and that involved investigations, reducing crime, proactive operations and so forth.
Q. What do you say about the circumstances, if any, that a crime manager would involve him or herself in at the level of taking statements from potential witnesses or complainants or victims and the like?
A. Generally, that's not what's done by a crime manager.
Q. I just want to ask you some questions about the structure of the detectives office and where you were based as crime manager --
A. At Newcastle.
Q. -- at Newcastle, say, in 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. You were based at Waratah?
A. Yes, I was based at Waratah.
Q. And the investigations manager was based here in Newcastle City?
A. Newcastle, with all the detectives, apart from any --
Q. What staff was available in terms of the detectives?
A. Look, the structure was that we had a - for the detectives office we had an investigations manager, which was Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn. There were five detective sergeants and I think we had 25 investigators or detectives all based at Newcastle and at various times there might have been some in the drug unit or in other areas, but that was generally the structure at Newcastle.
Q. In a line management sense, you reported to the commander?
A. Yes .
Q. The investigations manager reported to you as crime manager?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. The detective sergeants reported to the investigations manager?
A. Yes .
Q. And would generally the detectives of rank below detective sergeant report to various detective sergeants within the detectives office?
A. Yes, that's generally how it works, yes.
Q. I just asked you a question a while ago and you said that generally a crime manager wouldn't take statements.
A. Yes.
Q. I think in Lake Macquarie, for instance, you've had some involvement in getting involved with investigations as a crime manager, particularly one big matter that involved child sexual assault; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In the context perhaps of using that as an example, would you describe to the Commissioner why it is that a crime manager wouldn't usually be involved in the taking of witness statements?
A. My view is, and this goes for not just crime managers but often detective sergeants, if you are running an
Q. Can I ask you, you've got a habit of speaking quickly, and the transcript typists need to keep up. If you could try and slow yourself down or, in the alternative, say one quick sentence and then have a gap before the next quick one.
A. Can you repeat the question again?
Q. Perhaps in the context of the Orkopoulos
investigation, you might explain to the Commissioner why it is you say that, in your practice at least, a crime manager wouldn't be involved at the level of actually taking witness statements?
A. Yes. In my opinion, and what I found is best practice, is if you are running an investigation, a major investigation, it makes more sense and it's easier to run an investigation if you are not directly involved in matters on a day-to-day basis, so you can sit back --
Q. Articulate why that is.
A. Because if you are involved in taking a statement, you may have a preconceived view of where the investigation is going, or you may miss something that's happening in a fluid-type thing. So it's no different to whether you are running a homicide or something like that. As a detective sergeant and it's a live investigation, in my opinion it's important that who ever is in charge of that sits back and takes in everything that's occurring so they can give directions and they are up-to-date with the event that's occurring, rather than being locked away in a room taking a statement or interviewing somebody, things are happening but you are not controlling. So it's a matter of I suppose managing that incident and managing resources and making sure that things are going where they should be going.
Q. In your practice as a crime manager, what review would you have of witness statements that were taken by other people lower down the chain of command than yourself? A. We read them - we read the statement or listen to or read the transcript of any interviews, and plus they would personally brief you and say, "This is what has been said," as it was ongoing.
Q. Would it be part of a crime manager's role to then perhaps make further requisitions about additional statements from either other witnesses or from the same
witness?
A. Yes, can be - one of many roles, yes.
Q. You have a perception set out at paragraph 6 of your statement that when the file that ultimately became Strike Force Lantle came to your attention, you had perceived that it had been a file from Strike Force Georgiana?
A. Yes, this is my recollection a couple of weeks ago we're talking about.
Q. Can I ask you about that? Your recollection that it came from Strike Force Georgiana, was that based on that you had understood that it came from the Lake Macquarie --
A. Yeah --
Q. -- Local Area Command?
A. I'm not saying it came out of the Strike Force Georgiana investigation. I'm saying it came from those offices who I think were attached to Strike Force Georgiana.
Q. Strike Force Georgiana was commenced at a time that you were the crime manager at Lake Macquarie?
A. That's correct.
Q. That was a matter, as we've heard, that involved investigation into child sexual assault allegations and ultimately convictions in relation to at least some clergy.
A. That's correct.
Q. Was Detective Sergeant Kristi Faber attached to that strike force from its inception, to your recollection? A. Yes, she was the officer in charge as long as I was there.
Q. Without going into the particular details of those investigations that were caught by that, is that a strike force that varied in terms of the detective power that was allocated to it from time to time?
A. Yes, that would be correct. That's no different to most strike forces or investigations that you run. The staffing level goes up and down as required and depending on what phase and what's happening with the investigation.
Q. A strike force, is it generally allocated initially to a detective sergeant?
A. No, not always. It's just based on ability. There
are some matters that you'd probably prefer that a detective sergeant would run.
Q. Is the allocation of a detective sergeant one of the indicators that a matter is seen as being a serious matter? A. No, not always. Sometimes they are not available. They might have other jobs. It just depends on basically in a perfect world you'd have a detective sergeant in every one, but it doesn't work that way, unfortunately, so you have to work out who you think is the best to run that particular investigation.
Q. Can you explain in outline to the Commissioner what the process if there is a need for extra resources to be allocated to a strike force. Say if it starts off with one or two officers, what is the procedure in terms of the call and then allocation of more detective resources, if needed? A. I suppose there are two separate issues there. One is that we can provide additional resources from our own command and that would be based on something investigators are telling me, "We need more staff," or whatever and then it's a matter for me I suppose to determine whether they do. There are also oftentimes when an investigation goes outside of what we can probably provide to it or may go across numerous boundaries and then we would approach other local area commands, whether they can supply staff. That's an ongoing basis whether you need more staff or you don't need more staff.
Q. Can you now remember from your own memory without being taken to documents when it was that you first had any involvement with the file that ultimately became Strike Force Lantle?
A. My recollection is that the file was sent to me from Dave Wadde11, who was the crime manager at Lake Macquarie.
Q. Mr Tayler, in front of you, there are three white volumes. Keep your statement there where you can see it and then have reference to it. There are three white volumes. One is called volume 1 of 3 . Can you get that in front of you. First of all, just to identify them, and I don't know that I'11 need to take you to them individually, would you look at tab 25. Are the materials that are behind tab 25 notes from your diary that you had some access to, and you'11 see they have been redacted to take out irrelevant material.
A. Yes, that appears to be the case. That first entry is
nothing to do with this matter, though.
Q. I was going to clarify that with you. The diary entry of 10 July 2009 isn't relevant at all to this matter?
A. Nothing to do with this matter.

MR HUNT: Ultimately, if there is a time at which the tender bundles or part of them are tendered, Commissioner, we'll be asking you to not receive that matter into evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR HUNT: That particular page, for the record, has page number 75 at the bottom.
Q. Can you see there in front of you, Mr Tayler, there is a laminated turquoise-and-white list?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the pseudonym list. I want you to look carefully at particularly number 21.
A. Yes.
Q. Number 24.
A. Yes.
Q. And number 11.
A. Yes.
Q. They might not be the only ones, but $I$ want you to have those entries closely in mind if it becomes relevant as you are giving evidence.
A. Right.
Q. If you think you are going to mention the name of a victim and you are a bit worried about where the pseudonym is, I'd rather you identify your concern about where the pseudonym is rather than accidentally say the name.
A. Okay.
Q. Are we understood?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you now move to tab 30A in volume 1. For instance, you'11 see in the second paragraph of the document that's behind 30A that there is a redaction and
the pseudonym that you see at number 21 of the list is there, [AL]?
A. Yes.
Q. That just gives you an idea of the process that has been undertaken in terms of the documents. Is this the document under the hand of Detective Inspector David Waddell, a memo to you from himself as crime manager then of Lake Macquarie to yourself as crime manager New South Wales City LAC - that was the first that you came to know about the file that ultimately became Strike Force Lantle? A. I think David rang me before the file came across, but, yeah, pretty well.
Q. In terms of the written record, that would be, on your assessment, the first written document.
A. Yes.
Q. Will you then turn to tab 32. Does tab 32 reflect a further email forwarding on some other material that was forwarded to you by Detective Chief Inspector Waddell?
A. Yes .
Q. And, similarly, behind tab 33 , the same, some further material forwarded on?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree that the character of that material in terms of particularly what's behind tab 33 is consistent with Waddell forwarding on to you for attention material that's consistent at least in relation to that document of Joanne McCarthy providing source materials to the Police Force for investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you now turn to tab 38 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Tab 38 is, in summary, an email from Paul Jacob, detective inspector and manager of the sex crimes team within the Sex Crimes Squad within State Crime Command; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you remember, looking back now, whether you had had any conversations with Paul Jacob about the file that ultimately became Strike Force Lantle before this email
interaction?
A. That's a good question. I don't believe we had. I don't think $I$ had spoken to him at that stage.
Q. Just familiarise yourself, and I know you looked at these matters briefly, but there is effectively a request by Mr Jacob, otherwise known as Jaco --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to you to follow up a phone call that he had had from a solicitor in South Australia. You can see that? A. Yes.
Q. Then I want to take your attention - sorry to jump around a bit, but it is necessary - to the items behind tab 39. Tab 39 is a report by a solicitor to somebody within the Catholic Church reporting on the phone call that apparently ensued between yourself and that solicitor, Tony Fuller, on 20 May 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. Reading what Fuller reports to Monsignor David Cappo, do you agree that that seems consistent with your recollection to be a fair summary of the conversation that you are likely to have had with solicitor Fuller back on 20 May 2010?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. In fact, included within the conversation that you had with Fuller was that you had been sent some materials, you had been sent some material that involved some media interest in the matter, and that the file was being assessed and, if you thought it was appropriate, that the matter might be forwarded on to the sex crimes section or squad for some assessment after that assessment. Is that a fair recitation of the phone call?
A. Yes.
Q. Now I want you to turn to that which is behind tab 38A.
A. Yes.
Q. That is your submission as crime manager Newcastle City dated 20 May submitting the file - I'11 call it that way from now on - the file be forwarded to Sex Crimes State Crime Command for investigation.
A. Yes.
Q. And Superintendent Max Mitchel1, was he your commander at the time of this?
A. Yes.
Q. Just tell me if my reading of - you might be more familiar with then Superintendent Mitchell's handwriting. Are you familiar with it?
A. Vaguely.
Q. Is my interpretation of his rather elusive handwriting this:

Content and recommendation agreed to.
State crime charter ...
A. "And risk to organisation if not investigated appropriately."
Q. Is that police speak for the reason that it's appropriate that it go off to --
A. State Crime Command. That was our opinion, yes.
Q. Can you unwrap, in layman's terms, for the Commissioner effectively what is meant by then Superintendent Mitchell's reference to those things?
A. The risk to the organisation I suppose, I assume - I'm only guessing what Max would be saying really - if you want me to guess what he's referring to --
Q. I don't want you to guess. He'11 give evidence. We can ask him.
A. Yes, you'11 have to ask him about that.
Q. Is it a fair proposition that the conversation that you had with the solicitor on behalf of the then Archbishop of Adelaide was one of the factors that you took into account together with other things that you had already
read in the file in forming the view that it was proper
that the matter should go to State Crime Command?
A. Not the fact that I had a conversation with the solicitor, no, but the rank or the position of Archbishop Wilson was a concern to us.
Q. Could you say to the Commissioner what it was about that that made it a concern?
A. I think we could see that - it had a scope of having, I suppose, some political issues I suppose is the best way to have it with such a high-ranking person in the Catholic Church having allegations against him and, for that reason, we thought it more appropriate for State Crime Command to have a look at it based on the fact that it involved such senior hierarchy.
Q. What would it be about the resources or the ability of the State Crime Command compared with Newcastle City LAC that would make you think that that might be a good idea? A. Look, I don't know about resources or what resources they had, but it's more in regards to that that was their total line of work and they were the experts in that field, so that was my reason for putting the report in.

MR HUNT: Commissioner, I know Mr Tayler has been waiting patiently all day as a civilian to get into the witness box, but unfortunately it is now 4.35. The immutable schedule means that we will be hearing some evidence from Assistant Commissioner York at 9.30 and I am hoping that Mr Tayler is happy to come back in the morning and we will hope to resume his evidence-in-chief and, indeed, the balance of his evidence tomorrow at some stage.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, Mr Tayler, but your evidence has to be broken up and indeed by another witness. If you would join us tomorrow, we would be much appreciative. Thank you.

AT 4.35PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO TUESDAY, 14 MAY 2013 AT 9.30AM
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